

THE
AMERICAN QUARTERLY
CHURCH REVIEW.

VOL. XXIII.—APRIL, 1871.—No. 1.

ART. I.—THE MODERN PULPIT.

Sermons. BY HENRY MELVILL, D.D. *Edited by* RIGHT REV. C. P. McILVAINE, D.D. *New York, James Miller, 1870.*

Liddon's University Sermons. *Boston, E. P. Dutton & Co., 1868.*

Sermons. BY HENRY WARD BEECHER. *New York, Harper & Brothers, 1868.*

Sermons. BY C. H. SPURGEON. *New York, Sheldon & Co., 1866.*

Sermons Preached at Brighton. BY THE LATE REV. FREDERICK W. ROBERTSON. *New York, Harper & Brothers, 1870.*

THE ordinary discourse in its composition, and in its delivery, can be estimated wholly by rhetorical rules. An oration of Demosthenes is as much a work of art as a statue of Phidias. Cicero applied to style all the profundity of his philosophy. If our modern oratory abounds more in fact than fancy, and sacrifices polish for effect, it yet always would conform itself to the principles of human nature, and the peculiarities of a prosaic age. Thus the rhetorician and the speaker have only to investigate the laws of the mind, and invent those corresponding methods best adapted to please, or convince, or persuade. We are

apt to forget that while the oration must be measured only by rules of art, in the Sermon *two* elements are to be constantly regarded. It must, indeed, for its perfection, shape itself according to those canons of eternal truth which philosophical criticism has derived from an investigation of man's nature. But, if it does no more, it is powerless to accomplish its grandest purpose. Its reliance, after all, is in the co-operation of the Holy Ghost.

Remembering that the two great ends of Christian oratory are conversion, and instruction, we shall find its best Scriptural models in St. Peter, and St. Paul. How complete the preparation of the former for his Pentecostal work! He had vigorous common sense. He had a bold, intrepid, heroic spirit. He had intense sympathies. His self-confidence had been melted into tears, and humility, and gratitude by the mild rebuke of his loving Lord. Before him were his infatuated countrymen who had crowded to the temple from every part of the world. His aim was their conversion to a Saviour rejected and crucified. St. Peter pierces them in the conscience by that murderous sin which includes all guilt. He fixes on them the blood of their own Messiah. In his discourse everything accords with the laws of the mind, and the genius of the occasion. But all this would have availed little. A power from Heaven had before been long sought. Days of Prayer had preceded the discourse. Hence the storm, the fire, the tongues, the conversion of the multitude.

St. Paul as a preacher belongs to a higher type than St. Peter. He had the largeness, and the refinement of generous culture. In fire, in grasp, in style, in all oratorical gifts, except, perhaps, elocution, he was at once a Demosthenes, and a Cicero. He could convert to the faith, and he could instruct in the faith. He could awe kings, and sway the multitude. He could convince the Jew, and persuade the heathen. He could inform the intellect, move the heart, arouse the conscience, change the life. He could proclaim the Gospel with the same success at Jerusalem, or Athens, or Rome, and confirm by the Epistle those whom he had converted by the Sermon. Yet with all his perfect human gifts he never forgot that his crucified, his risen, his ascended, his mediating Saviour could only be revealed to dead souls by the Holy Ghost.

As was to be expected, our faint and scattered hints and

glimpses of the subsequent primitive preaching show that the human element was subordinate to the Divine. Teachers were frequently unlettered men taken from the people to convert the people. Discourses therefore were rather harangues than orations. Miracles often supplied the place of culture. Prayer was more sought than preparation. The abiding presence of the Spirit in the assemblies of believers was powerful above all natural gifts. But when the Church had conquered the world: when nobles, and kings, and emperors bowed before the Cross: when rhetoricians and philosophers received Jesus Christ: when Athens, and Rome, and Alexandria, and Carthage were no more seats of heathen mythology, but centres of our Holy Religion, the circumstances and characteristics of the Pulpit were correspondingly changed. Even the golden words of St. Chrysostom evince the labored processes of the orator. Cyprian, Augustin, Tertullian were Christian rhetoricians. How hard for a Preacher in St. Sophia, addressing the excitable multitude, and the gorgeous court, to rise above the passion, and the splendor, and declare in simple words of power that Cross which must wound the conscience, and pierce the heart in the case of both populace, and emperor, before can be found the peace of pardon, and the hope of Eternal Life!

Of the mediæval preaching we have slight opportunities of forming correct opinions. That it was encumbered and degraded by spurious relics, and monstrous legends, and pretended miracles, and a thousand grotesque superstitions, is undeniable. But the writings of such men as St. Bernard and Kempis prove that the glow of a divine love was not extinguished in that oppressive gloom. Pious monks issued from many a cell devoted to mortification, and meditation, and prayer, and brightened by the presence of Jesus Christ, to proclaim to the people that Salvation only to be revealed by the Spirit of God. Many of the Sermons of that scholastic period were doubtless as remarkable for learning as they were successful through prayer.

The era of the Reformation was unquestionably marked not only by the restoration of doctrinal truth, but by a powerful spiritual movement among the masses. In all classes there was a hungering for the Scriptures. There was joy in a discovered Saviour. There was an heroic love of the truth which dared the chain and

the stake. The learning of both Continental and English reformers inspired by this spirit, often glowed with a Divine energy, and their sermons brought Salvation to the people. The Pulpits of Universities, blessed by the Holy Ghost, were centres of spiritual power. Erudite scholars were successful practical preachers. But controversy soon defiled and darkened everything. Luther, who saved Christendom by dragging from the corruptions of Romanism the Scriptural doctrine of a sinner's justification by Faith in an atoning Saviour, became coarse, abusive, and disgusting. Lampoons and scurrilities too often took the place of mediæval fables and superstitions. In assaulting error men wounded truth. In exposing spiritual slavery they abused the freedom of the Gospel. In assailing the Pope they dishonored the Saviour. The sermons of the Reformation are not models for the Pulpit. Again the human element was seen prevailing over the Divine. It must be painfully confessed that the sermons of Fenelon, Bossuet, Massillon, and Bourdaloue, encumbered as they are with Popish error, are unctious, elevated, dignified when compared with the sermons of Luther, and Calvin, and Latimer, and Knox, who were undoubtedly the apostles of a restoration of Christendom to that primitive doctrine which alone can convert the world.

When we pass to a later period in the history of the English Pulpit we discover almost every thing that can exalt religious discourse. Never have the truths of Salvation in their simplicity, their harmony, their fulness been more profoundly, more learnedly, more eloquently expounded than by the succession of the great Anglican Divines. Genius, erudition, and piety unite in their sermons. Scarcely any gift, or any grace is left unrepresented in their writings, which will be treasures for study and imitation during all future ages. The English Establishment has perhaps accomplished its work, and will pass away like a shadow, but it will leave behind it a substantial and enduring blessing. The endowment of its Parishes, and its Universities have conferred on the world treatises, and discourses immortal as the truths they so variously and so ably unfold, and enforce. Yet, if the aim of the Sermon is to convince, to persuade, to convert, by bringing the Gospel, through the Power of the Holy Ghost, into a saving contact with the consciences, and hearts, and lives of men, the Anglican Divines were perhaps deficient in that glow, that

unction, that energy, that directness, essential to attracting, and moving the multitude.

Not pausing now to investigate the influence on the Pulpit of the great English Revival of the last century, we may hasten to consider the Preaching of a period more modern. It is not unlikely that Chalmers is a connecting link between the Past and the Present. His earnestness, his enthusiasm, his power remind us of the days of Wesley, and Whitefield, while his philosophical speculations, his comprehensive thoughts, his rolling periods, his sublime excursions into the regions of science, and of poetry, unquestionably opened for the Sermon a new field, and gave it an impress and an impulsion even now uneffaced, and unexpended. Had not Chalmers lived, most of the volumes whose names preface this Article, would probably have wanted some present characteristic.

Nor in the pulpit of our own age is there any degeneracy of genius. Begin with Melvill who leads the bright array of distinguished preachers we have selected as representatives of the modern sermon! As a specimen of the whole select a single discourse! We will take that entitled, "The Difficulties of Scripture." How simple and admirable the exordium! How clear, how natural, how comprehensive the arrangement! How manly, how glowing, how irresistible the argument! How pathetic and how powerful the peroration! The style unaffected, yet elevated, peculiar yet natural,—at once flowing, impressive, and sustained—is as much a part of the man as the color of his cheek, or the fire of his eye, and has all the magnificence of Chalmers without his glittering coldness, or oratorical excess. We know no discourse in the English language where argument is presented in a form more striking and more fascinating than in some passages we will quote from that already mentioned.

"We can feel, whilst the volume of Holy Writ lies open before us, and facts are presented which seem every way infinite—height, and breadth, and length and depth, all defying the boldest journeyings of the spirit—we can feel the quick pulse of an eager wish to scale the mountain, or fathom the abyss. But at the same time we know and we feel that a Bible without difficulties were a firmament without stars. We know, and we feel, that a far off land, enamelled, as we believe it, with a loveliness that is not of this earth, and inhabited by a tenantry gloriously distinct from our own order of

being, would not be the magnificent and richly-peopled domain which it is, if its descriptions overpassed not the outlines of human geography. We know and we feel that the Creator of all things, He who stretched out the heavens, and sprinkled them with worlds, could not be what we are assured He is, inaccessiblely sublime, and awfully great, if there could be given to us a portrait of His nature and properties, whose every feature might be sketched by a human pencil, whose every characteristic scanned by a human vision."

"If the Bible be God's revelation of Himself to mankind, it is a most fair expectation that at one time, or another, the whole of this revelation will be clear and accessible; that the obscure points which we cannot now elucidate, and the lofty points which we cannot now scale, will be enlightened by the flashings of a brighter luminary, and given up to the marchings of a more vigorous inquiry,—and therefore in every scriptural difficulty I read the pledge of a mighty enlargement of the human faculties. In every mystery, though a darkness thick as the Egyptian, may now seem to shroud it, can be found one bright and burning spot glowing with promise that there shall yet come a day, when every power of the soul, being wrought into a celestial strength, I shall be privileged, as it were, to stretch out the hands of the lawgiver and roll back the clouds which here envelop the truth."

When we turn from Melvill to Liddon we notice a difference, but not a descent in the scale of pulpit excellence. The learned professor who teaches youth at Oxford, draws before him, in London, a promiscuous multitude, crowding the vast Cathedral to hang upon his words. The University cloister has once more produced a popular preacher. While Liddon is a student of the past; while he is a profound believer in ancient creeds and liturgies; while he is imbued with all the conservatism inherent in the genius of the English Church, he is yet a man who comprehends his age, and whose sermons breathe and throb in intense sympathy with the struggles of the Present, and the aspirations of the Future. If his desires for the unity of Christendom sometimes make him too tolerant of Greek and Roman error, and lead him unconsciously to exaggerate the office of the priesthood, and the efficacy of sacraments, yet no modern preacher has more boldly and constantly proclaimed the great central doctrines of evangelical truth. In scholarship, in grasp, in comprehensiveness, in thoroughness of investigation, and fulness of development, he is perhaps now the first of Christian Orators. It will be difficult in the entire range of the English pulpit to surpass the following passage from his sermon styled, "The Lessons of the Holy Manger."

"The Gospel is at once a religion, and a theology; one side of it is familiar, easy of comprehension to all, popular, concrete. But it has another side in which it appears as a system of abstract truth, difficult of understanding even to practiced and sanctified intellect. Here it has relations neither few nor unimportant with history, with language, with the physical sciences, with psychology, with metaphysics. It is itself the *Scientia Scientiarum*, the queen of sciences, the meeting-point of all the ways of thought, the ultimate arbiter of the many questions which move the mind of man. Thus it is digested into treatises; it affords play and occupation to the most keen and earnest thinkers; it is nothing less than a vast intellectual power. Reason, imagination, the sense of truth, and the sense of beauty are all entertained by it. But the Gospel has another aspect. It is not merely proclaimed by the higher intelligences; it is wrapped in swaddling-clothes; it is laid in a manger. The Gospel is not merely a philosophy; it is the religion of mankind; it is the religion of the uneducated and the poor. It appeals to their daily wants and their deepest sympathies. It speaks in plain words of the sense of sin, of the atoning blood, of the power of the blessed Spirit, of the power of the sacraments. It speaks of the presence, the providence, the love of Jesus. It brightens the present evil world which presses sorely on their spirits and their strength by pointing to a world beyond the tomb, where the fondest imaginings of happiness are more than realized, and where the most cruel wrongs and woes are amply and forever redressed. It may be guilty, perchance, of many offences against the laws of "good taste," yet, He, our Lord, is there, in the divine simplicity of His wonderful revelation. The same adorable Saviour is there in His manger: the Infinite Truth is lodging Himself around this easy language and these simple instructive forms in the heart and intellect of the people."

It is with pain we pass from the discourses of two distinguished preachers representing legitimate and inevitable schools of thought in the English Church, to those of a third, not inferior in genius but suspicious in orthodoxy. Robertson was the pioneer of an alien party whose lax doctrines meet an indignant rebuke in every part of the venerable Prayer-book. He admitted principles of interpretation, which legitimately pursued would eliminate from the Scripture, every supernatural attestation, every claim to inspiration, and every divine mystery. He proclaimed a view of the atonement which robs the blood of the Cross of all the efficacy imparted by incarnate Godhead, in the plan of propitiation devised by Eternal Wisdom to reconcile eternal Love and eternal Justice, and secure pardon through penitent faith to the sinner while upholding the throne of the Creator. The very piety and genius of Robertson give sweetness to the poison of error which distils through his eloquent discourses. Yet we must acknowledge his many excel-

lencies. He had a brilliant imagination. He had a creative power. He had intense sympathy with nature. He had a tender compassion for the people. He had a manly love of right. He had a noble indignation against wrong. He had the spirit of a martyr in what he conceived to be duty. He throbs and burns with large charities for mankind. Many of his sermons stir the Christian heart in its deepest experiences, and animate with the noblest zeal to imitate the perfect manhood of our Saviour. Had Robertson lived to emancipate himself from the snares of rationalistic error, he might to-day have been the most distinguished and the most useful preacher in Christendom. In his sermon styled, "Realizing the Second Advent," are passages difficult to excel in truth, or beauty.

"It is no chance, nor fate which sits at the wheel of this world's revolutions. It was no fortuitous concourse of atoms which massed themselves into a world of beauty. It was no accidental train of circumstances which has brought the human race to their present state. It was a living God; most men know nothing beyond what they see. It is exactly the opposite of this that makes a Christian. Move where he will there is a Thought and a Presence he cannot put aside. He is haunted forever by the Eternal mind. God looks out from the clear sky, and through the thick darkness—is present in the rain-drop that trickles down the branches, and in the tempest that crashes down the forest. A living Redeemer stands beside him,—goes with him—talks with him as a man with his friend. And there is one word full of meaning from which we collect the truth of sympathy. It is that little word of appropriation—"My" Redeemer; power is shown by God's attention to the vast; sympathy by His condescension to the small. It is not the thought of heaven's sympathy with which we are impressed when we gaze through the telescope on the mighty world of space, and gain an idea of what is meant by the Infinite. Majesty and power are there, but the very vastness excludes the thought of sympathy. It is when we look into the world of insignificance which the microscope reveals, and find that God has gorgeously painted the atoms of creation, and exquisitely furnished forth all that belongs to minutest life, that we feel that God sympathizes and individualizes."

The design of this Article in representing the modern pulpit would not be accomplished if we omitted the notice of eminent preachers who out of the succession of the Order of the Church, are yet in the succession of her essential Faith. First among these, unquestionably, in oratorical gifts and popular attractiveness, is Spurgeon. The man, who, year after year, fills with eager crowds, pew, and aisle, and gallery of the vast Metropolitan Taber-

nacle of London cannot be overlooked. As in his manner he cannot claim that refinement so pleasing in a clergyman, neither in his style can he claim the graces of the scholar. He often shows himself coarse, crude, vituperative. He indulges cant, and slang, and wit in proclaiming the solemn messages of the Gospel. His assault on our baptismal office certainly does not breathe the spirit of charity. His enmity to the English Church seems a passion. We can understand how he frequently disgusts and repels from his tabernacle, refined and cultivated auditors. And yet within his sphere he has no living rival. When he attempts the theologian he is absurd; when he contents himself to be a preacher he is overwhelming. If it is the function of the pulpit to attract and impress the multitude; if its purpose is to arouse the conscience, to make the sinner tremble before the bar of God, and reveal to him the eternal penalty of his guilt; if its aim is to proclaim to the faith of the penitent a pardoning, a present, a perfect Saviour, then certainly Spurgeon has a high title to the name of a true Christian orator.

In our new world Mr. Beecher has achieved for himself a position, distinguished and original. Measured by the standard of genius he is not inferior to the European preachers. Could men be converted by brilliant imagery, by startling utterances, by sparkling wit, by dramatic action, by a Gospel exaggerating love at the expense of justice, and relaxing the divine law to excite human sympathy, then would Plymouth pulpit flash and burn with saving power. But much as we admire the splendid gifts of Mr. Beecher, and much as we have been transported by many noble passages in his sermons, we suspect his orthodoxy in regard to the atonement, and doubt whether the efficacy of the cross, the solemnity of the judgment, the awfulness of eternity, and the presence of the Holy Ghost, can be deeply felt in an assembly, one moment moved to tears by the pathos of the orator, and the next tittering with laughter at his conceits. Such eccentricities may attract the crowd without benefiting the crowd. Many will believe that what is gained in numbers and applause, is not equalled by what is lost in respect and reverence.

And here we may remark that while claiming so much for the representative preachers of the nineteenth century, we may be permitted to question, whether, in some essential points, they do not

fall below the great representative preachers of the eighteenth century. In all the volumes of sermons we have perused, amid pages of fascinating interest, it is surprising how little is said which would direct a plain man to Jesus Christ. Discourse rather dazzles around the Cross than points to the Cross. The remedy for sin is often eulogized in a glittering pomposity of language where there is no intention and no effort to press its reception on dying souls. Salvation is oftener discussed rather than urged. The human element of the sermon is exalted at the expense of the divine. Primitive Christianity depended not only on the truth, but on the power of the Holy Ghost. The prayer of faith was the secret of her triumphs. There was a presence of the Godhead in her assemblies to wound, and to heal, and to save. It is to be feared that our modern pulpit in its efforts to attract and please, too frequently places man before the Cross, and earth before Heaven. We need in this respect a return to apostolic models. Our churches are places where we oftener go to hear oratory than to find God. Nor need we travel back to the early centuries to seek reproof for our error. Turn to the sermons of Wesley and Whitefield, who, in the apostolic order, proclaimed the apostolic faith with apostolic power! You are led at once to your heart. Your conscience is searched. Your life is laid bare. You are convicted by the law. You are melted before the Cross. Justification by Faith, Regeneration by the Holy Ghost, Salvation from sin, the joy of an immortal life, are urged persistently on your acceptance. The way to our Saviour is made so obvious that whoever seeks may obtain. What thus moves the sincere individual moved the waiting assembly. Whitefield and Wesley were followed by the multitude. Prayer brought down on them a power which sealed the Truth unto Salvation. There was eccentricity. There was extravagance. There was fanaticism. But there were also penitence, faith, conversion. Perhaps it would be well for our age to study without prejudice the discourses of these two great English Evangelists. Whitefield, indeed, only excelled in a direct, fiery, hortatory eloquence which has never been surpassed. In voice, and style, and manner he was the unequalled Christian orator. If Wesley did not rival him in burning words he exceeded him in all other gifts. He was a refined scholar. He was a finished gentleman. He was an elegant

poet. He was a masterly organizer. He was a man of faith, and prayer, and power. While his sermons are not wholly suited to our own period they deserve the careful and profound attention of the Philosopher and the Divine.

There now remains for us a practical inquiry. Are the conditions of our age favorable to the efficiency of the Pulpit? Perhaps we can more intelligently answer the question by considering it under two aspects, and confining it to our own Communion.

The aim of the Pulpit we have before remarked is two-fold. It would convert, and it would instruct. The first function implies directness of appeal, boldness of argument, energy of faith, earnestness of persuasion. The second function implies patience, study, reflectiveness, comprehensiveness. The genius of the Church, without doubt, encourages the latter, and discourages the former. She proceeds on the supposition that her children, born in Baptism, and instructed by Parent, and Sponsor, and Rector, in Scripture, Creed, and Catechism, shall grow up silently into Christ as the tree rises in the air and sunlight. Nothing is left to those sudden experiences where the conversion resembles the flash of the lightning and the burst of the tempest. Besides, the calm spirituality, and solemnizing majesty of her Liturgy compose the soul into a tranquility unfavorable to impulse and emotion. The characteristics of her Pulpit therefore correspond to the object of her instruction and the nature of her service. Her discourse is usually tempered, dignified, educational. And the Christian character developed under such circumstances is certainly the most harmonious and the most beautiful. If the Church was now, as in England three centuries ago, the universal mother of a people all brought to her Fonts and her Pastors, she might better confine her Pulpits to the simple work of religious instruction. But in our own country she is in the midst of vast populations who live in a darkness deep as that of heathenism, and she can never be true to her whole mission until she provides a ministry who can carry the Gospel to these masses. Lights, and colors, and censers will not convert men. They may for a *little* time amuse children. Even our incomparable Liturgy will not attract the rude multitude. Our claims to Apostolic Catholicity are to them utterly unintelligible. They will follow earnest preachers and sympathetic pastors wherever they may be found. A powerful Pulpit will

command a listening people. A ministry to the masses will always control the masses. Do we mourn that the narrowness of our sphere does not correspond to the greatness of our claim? Do we blush that with the primitive order we have so little of the primitive success among the poor? Do we search for a link which will bind us not to a class but to mankind? We will find it, not in our modern expedients, but in God's own institution. The ordained ambassadors of heaven are the appointed agencies to connect the people and the Church. Nor need they pervert their divine function by degrading themselves into charlatans. The tricks of the lecturer, and the machinery of the revivalist soon exhaust and defeat themselves. A Gospel properly proclaimed is its own attraction. It appeals to man's deepest wants. It has the strongest possible hold on human nature. It is exhaustless in its themes, and universal in its application. Popular sky-rockets after a sudden flash and noise, leave a deeper darkness. The great sun, still, and bright, and bounteous, shines, the source of light and life forever. What the Church wants, to fulfil her entire mission, is a clergy, educated, consecrated, anointed by the Holy Ghost, prepared to address all classes of mankind, qualified to instruct and to convert, and who by the power of the Pulpit shall find their way to the hearts and homes of the people.

Now, if these views are sound, we perceive how hard it is to provide a ministry, particularly required by this rapid, sensational, practical age. No body of men in the world more commands our respect than our theological instructors, and no body of men more excites our sympathy. If piety, and learning, and ability could accomplish their object this generation and this country would not be mourning over the distance of the Church from the masses. Nor are the clergy to be sternly censured. As a rule, no class in the community are so pure, so elevated, and so accomplished. Neither are our theological students to be depreciated. In gifts, and culture they are perhaps superior to the average youth who devote themselves to the legal and medical professions. We are all really victims of circumstances which we can deplore, and yet do not amend.

Let us confine ourselves to the consideration of a particular case. Here is a graduate of a college who, after years of study, passes into the world crowned with academic honors. A brilliant career

opens to his ambition. He sincerely renounces the glitter of earth for a call from heaven. He feels in his own heart the peace, the joy, the hope of the Gospel, and is accepted by the Church to declare to others the Salvation which he esteems in himself an immortal gift. He passes into a Theological Seminary and for three years prepares to discharge his great commission. Here he finds every help in the instruction and in the example of his Professors. The spirit of the place is favorable to acquisition. But is it favorable to *discipline*? Is it favorable to *piety*? Is it favorable to *manliness*? Is it favorable to obtain the tact, the enterprise, the courage necessary to a successful prosecution of the ministerial work in such an age, and in such a country? With what severe labors the mechanic is developed in muscle and perfected in skill! With what watchings, and drillings, and exercises the cadet is prepared for campaigns and battles! With what self-denials and crucifixions the Romish Priest is trained for warfare in the great Romish army! How easy for the Theological School to degenerate into a mere cloister of learned leisure, and if near our great metropolis, how subtle and how multiplied the attractions of concert, and opera, and theatre; and how easy for the glittering charms of even lawful and refined pleasure to relax the spiritual life and reduce the clerical vocation in the estimation of the student and of the world, to the level of a mere secular profession! How great the temptation then to be planning even within the walls sacred to divine instruction, for the ease of wealthy parishes rather than the salvation of redeemed souls! How fearful the risk of emasculation in those who need the heroic spirit of martyrs in the prosecution of their holy work! How hard for the Pulpit under such circumstances to find men equal to its high demands—disciplined as well as educated—earnest, active, consecrated—imbued with the progressive spirit of the age, and not perverted by the material spirit of the age—persistently seeking the salvation of mankind, and to the rewards of earth preferring the crown of heaven!

But we will suppose the parish obtained. What difficulties now confront the faithful young clergyman! Perhaps he is greeted with warm acclamations by his new people, and his path seems through flowers. He soon discovers over his church a cloud of debt. There is a threatening mortgage. There are unrented

pews. There are embarrassing claims. Discipline is relaxed. Divisions disturb. Pressed by demands for money parishioners have come to regard the clerical relation as a commercial arrangement, and the question is, will the rectorship *pay*? Will it sell the pews? Will it discharge the debts? Will it draw the crowd? On every side are ministers who resort to popular arts, popular themes, and popular harangues to gain hearers. Under such circumstances how hard to be faithful! How hard to imperil favor by enforcing discipline! How hard to seek souls instead of crowds! How hard to sacrifice present pecuniary interests and temporary plaudits for the good of the Church and the smile of Heaven! Yet it is just victory over such temptations that is to strengthen the character of the clergyman, and give the pulpit that manly independence and that divine power which are its truest dignity and glory. Let our young ministers conquer here, and they will conquer everywhere. From such struggles are born the noblest triumphs and successes of the sacred office.

And with all our discouragements there never was a period when men daring to be true could expect eventually so certain and so rich a reward. The day of unity will dawn on the Church. Small questions of postures and vestments, and colors and lights, and incense cannot forever disturb our peace. Our matchless Liturgy with a few changes might be made universal in its adaptation, and so meet our spiritual needs, that we would no more think of discussing little peculiarities of service than a gentleman thinks of discussing the fit and color of his perfect coat. Thus the Pulpit may be left free for the lofty purposes of the Church in presenting those vast and grand themes whose centre is the Cross and whose circumference is Eternity. Then will come on us from Heaven a brighter period of expansion, and elevation, and power.

But even in the peculiarities of our age and country are many hopeful indications. We, indeed, see on every side sham and materialism. Corruption is abroad in the land, tainting office with its polluting breath. Extravagance, dissipation, vice, crime are frightful in their effrontery and their excess. Vast corporations, lawless as a mediæval aristocracy with its castles, and barons, and retainers, are amassing wealth and power by oppressing the people, by bribing jurors, by buying judges, by controlling legislatures. Atheism, and Infidelity, and Schism, and practical Idol-

atry are banishing God from the hearts of men. Yet these stupendous perils are making Christians thoughtful. Earnest men are turning from small expedients to large measures. They see how powerless is any human agency to grapple with such Satanic forces. They are compelled to prayer, to faith, to heaven. Nothing can save us but a holy ministry commissioned by a holy Church, and baptized by the Holy Ghost, and amid the divisions of sects, and the abandonment of expedients, the Christianity of this Republic will more and more turn to the inspiring history, the conservative genius, the doctrinal purity, the spiritual Liturgy of our own Church which preserves the old creeds, the old offices, the old order, the old succession, the old Catholicity, and which is destined to have a new life, a new power, a new popularity, and a new triumph in this new world, if she will only submit her gold to the final test of another crucible.

ART. II.—DR. VINTON'S MANUAL.

A Manual Commentary on the General Canon Law and the Constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. BY FRANCIS VINTON, S.T.D., D.C.L., &c., &c. New York, E. P. Dutton & Co., 1870.

THIS Book appears to have originated in the practical work of the Ludlow Professor in the General Theological Seminary. His eminent learning, and deep researches have led him over a field that is to the clergy of the Church in this country comparatively unknown, and the utility of a foundation such as that the duties of which he so diligently discharges, is plainly suggested by a perusal of the pages of the Manual which he now generously lays before the Church. The design of the publication of the work, as modestly stated by the author in his preface, is to assist the student in his future ministry, and to furnish aid also to other teachers and pupils as well as to studious men in various departments. The purpose of the work is truly commendable, and the evident zeal with which it has been executed, prepares the reader to appreciate the sincerity with which its author humbly offers it to Christ and the Church.

The work divides itself into two parts, relating to, I. The common law of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, and, II., the preliminary history of the Constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, the legislative power and authority of the General Convention, and the Constitution of the Church. These headings are sufficient to indicate the scope of the work, and give promise of a general interest and value which a perusal does not disappoint. The compendious statement of the sources of the Common Law, and the exact and copious reference to authorities are well adapted to give to the readers of the Manual an increase in the knowledge of a subject, which, in this country, has never until recently received the attention to which its importance entitles it. There is also much valuable information concerning the matter of parliamentary order as applicable to the working of the General Convention under the Constitution; while as to the form of the work, the Catechetical arrangement can hardly be too highly commended. It does not need the apology which the writer makes for it. Besides the precedent of Grey which he cites, there are Dr. Hammond's practical Catechism, and the famous Doctor and Student, and other valuable treatises to give him countenance, while the advantage of such an arrangement is obvious to any one who opens a book for information rather than entertainment.

While we thus commend the Book, however, to the favorable consideration of those who may be interested in its subject, we must be permitted to do so with a word of caution. There are some defects in the Book which the author, should he think it right to do so, might easily supply in another edition, and there is some teaching in it to which we cannot assent. For example, with respect to the obligation of Ancient Canons we do not think the author so exact as he should be. He lays down the principle that the Catholic Canon Law in all things applicable belongs to us until we expressly disclaim its possession, (p. 18), and again, (p. 19), that the ancient Canons mentioned in the office for the consecration of a Bishop form a part of the Catholic code. He illustrates by reference to the first of the Apostolic Canons requiring three Bishops to consecrate a Bishop. But it does not appear to us, although possibly it may appear to the students in the light of the Professor's verbal comments, whether these canons are all of equal

obligation—whether any distinction is to be made between them, whether, *e. g.*, the ninth is binding, which provides that “all the faithful who come in and hear the Scriptures, but do not stay for the prayers and the Holy Communion are to be Excommunicated, as causing disorder in the Church.” The distinction which was so well put in one of the Professor’s recent communications to the Church Journal between faith and discipline does not appear in this place, and one is led to the conclusion that the canons of discipline in the Ancient Church are to be received as of equal authority with the decrees concerning the faith. What is said (pp. 22, 23,) of discipline rather strengthens the presumption that the ancient canons in general are part of the Law of the Church for its proper government. It is true that in a commentary upon Law, we should not expect an account of decrees concerning the faith, but we might expect that the obligation of canons of discipline should be more exactly defined. The limitation stated on p. 20 does not come up to the point which we believe the Professor would make in answer to a student’s question on this matter. “The Catholic code is absolutely obligatory when no rule is provided; the Foreign code of laws (*e. g.* the English ecclesiastical laws in the United States) is obligatory with two restraints, (1) that “they are adapted to the Constitution of the Church, and so are *proper*; (2) and not contradicted by the laws of the land and of this Church, and so are *legal* rules.’” Now to say that the foreign and ancient Catholic canons are of authority upon the footing of consent and usage, which is the ground we believe upon which the English lawyers recognize them, and to which the author (p. 20) refers, is one thing; to say that the ancient canons are absolutely obligatory when no rule is provided, and that the foreign code of laws, (including in one English inheritance those which though foreign in England were then sanctioned by custom) is obligatory with these two restraints, is quite another thing. The bearing of these ancient Canons of discipline upon us is a very important and delicate question, and one upon which it seems to us that the public are entitled to have in a published work, the benefit of the same comments which we must presume that the Professor supplies in the lecture room. One is certainly liable to draw the inference that a distinction is here made between the ancient canons and

the body of Ecclesiastical Law inherited from England, and that the former are absolutely obligatory where no rule is provided, and that the latter are obligatory so far as they are adapted to the Constitution of the Church, and where proper and not contradicted by law, are therefore legal. That is to say, we are bound to observe the ancient canons whether they are adapted to the Constitution of the Church or not, provided we have no substituted rule as to the matters for which they provide. The Constitution of the Church to which the author refers, is, we presume, not the written Constitution upon which he afterwards comments, but the body of the principles upon which the Church is founded and administered. The words in quotation marks are the words of an English writer, and as in England there is no express written Constitution, we understand the author to use the word by quotation in the same sense which it bears in England. We hardly think that he meant to bring us to the conclusion that in the absence of any rule of our own on a given subject, we would be bound by the rule of an ancient canon, even if it were contrary to the general principles of our Church, if it were out of harmony with the whole spirit of our present Church discipline. But again, (p. 21) there is an intimation of a distinction between "the law of consent, usage, and custom," and "the laws Catholic to which all separate or National Churches are bound to conform." We respectfully submit that on this important subject there is a want of clearness, especially in this, that the author does not distinctly bring out, what we presume he would teach, that ancient canons even of the general councils are not necessarily Catholic, not Catholic in the sense of having been always received and obeyed. In a commentary on the Canon Law of the Church, it seems natural to expect to find the grounds of the law traced to inheritance, acceptance, continuance, and usage. We had supposed this to be the principle upon which the ancient and foreign Canons were received in England, and from England among the Churches in this country. But more than this seems, though not clearly, to be laid down in the Manual. It is certainly upon this principle that foreign Canons become in England the law of the land,* and the principles of the obligation of law are the same

* 1 Blackstone's Commentaries, 55.

in civil and ecclesiastical matters. If the power by which a law is established have no jurisdiction over a country or a Church, that law has no force in that country or Church, except as it may be expressly adopted by the legislative authority therein, or may grow by usage and consent to have the force of law therein. Thus it happens that in a newly settled country, or a newly planted Church, some laws are expressly adopted by the legislative authority, and some accumulate by the living customs of the people. The laws of other Churches are often the principles by which cases are decided and acts are justified in our own. The more ancient, universal, and continuous any law or custom is, the better authority there is for it, but because it is ancient and was universal if it have not also been continuous, it can hardly be regarded as obligatory. We apprehend that ancient Canons, even those which were Catholic, *i. e.*, those laws which relate merely to discipline, stand upon just that footing with us. They are foreign canons passed by bodies that have no legislative jurisdiction over us, could not now have were they now existing except by our own consent, and therefore they have no binding force upon us except as they have been continuously recognized and passed down to us. Whenever they have been of sufficient importance to be needed and appreciated universally, then we have inherited the obligation to them; whenever they were local and temporary in their character they have been discontinued, and do not of themselves bind us. They may be the sources from which as we live on, we may draw out and develop rules to which long use may in the future give the force of law, but to say that they are absolutely obligatory where no other rule is provided, is a statement which needs qualification.*

There is another matter of fundamental importance, the author's treatment of which seems to be not only not clear, but ex-

* It might here have been incidentally inquired, whether Dr. Vinton has not placed the Tenth Article of the Constitution, and a Canon of the General Convention enacted in A. D., 1865, in an unnecessary antagonism. They strike us as referring to classes of Bishops entirely distinct. They have different names. They have different methods of election. They have different privileges. They have different disabilities. If the Article, and the Canon do not refer to different Bishops, we do not believe any body of men on earth so intelligent as our General Convention, ever committed so grave a blunder, and Dr. Vinton's Professorship has an additional claim to its existence, and its endowment.

ceptional. What the writer says does not impress us with the conviction that he fully understands the subject, and the theory upon which his teaching rests seems to us to be untrue in point of fact, and unchurchly in principle. He says in the course of his remarks concerning the relation of the Dioceses to the General Convention, that "any discoverable political analogy is beside the question of our ecclesiastical polity, and ought not to be admitted to prejudice the judgment." But although we should be unwilling to attribute to him any prejudice of judgment we may perhaps be allowed to say, that we think his desire to correct the prejudice of others has led him into error in the opposite direction.

It seems as if the one compelling idea in the mind of the writer almost throughout the second part of his work, was to demolish in the Church everything like the obnoxious state-sovereignty theory and to exalt triumphant upon its ruins the omnipotent and all-satisfying General Convention. Now we have no objection to the supremacy of the General Convention either in fact or in law—as it is in fact exercised, or as in law it is allowed to be exercised. But the idea which a student with little or no other information would derive from the Professor's Manual would be rather that of omnipotence than of supremacy, and to that we do object. If the Manual had taught the student that the Constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church was its fundamental and organic law, that by virtue of that Constitution, the General Convention exists as the supreme legislative body of the Protestant Episcopal Church, we do not think that any rational objection could have been made. Upon this principle it could consistently have taught that every Diocese, Bishop, clergyman and layman in the Protestant Episcopal Church was bound to obey the Constitutional Laws of the General Convention. In the practical work of the Church in this country, we do not think the Professor himself would ask more.

But he is so burdened with his own theory of the origin of that Constitution, that he brings learning and labor to establish it, and in so doing, he in our judgment so befogs the whole matter of the practical relations of the Dioceses to the General Convention that such a student as we have supposed, must be entirely lost, or must come to the conclusion that the Dioceses are and always have been, nothing—the General Convention is, and always has

been, everything—the whole Church. The theory of the writer, if we understand him, and we certainly have no intention to misrepresent him, is this: that the General Convention of 1789, by which the Constitution was adopted, was the whole Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States in council assembled (p. 80), and that by its own inherent and plenary powers, it gave the law to the whole Protestant Episcopal Church; and by the Protestant Episcopal Church, the writer means the clergy and laity in the whole United States in communion with the Church of England. This theory is with the writer a foundation; he bends everything to support it, and builds upon it throughout that part of his Manual which relates to the preliminary history, the legislative powers and authority of the General Convention, and the Constitution of the Church. We have not space to follow him throughout, but there are some admissions and statements contained in the Manual to which we advert as evidence of the truth of that, which, with all respect to the Professor, we have ventured to affirm—that his theory is untrue in point of fact, and unchurchly in principle.

The Manual teaches (p. 43), that the Church in this country became independent of the government of the Church of England on the 4th of July, 1776, the Bishop of London having been previously Bishop of the Church in the Colonies—that the political condition assumed by the Colonies after the Declaration of Independence, was that of Sovereign States in the union of alliance but independent of each other as of England; that the ecclesiastical condition of the Church in the several States was (p. 44), that of ecclesiastical independence, but without an Episcopal head, and that the Church in each State assumed the authority by virtue of its independence to make for itself necessary alterations in the Liturgy; that the Episcopal Church (p. 45), existed at the date of the Declaration of Independence in all the thirteen original States, and in the District of Maine; that the first step taken toward a union of the Churches in the States generally was (p. 46), in the meeting of several members of the Churches in the City of Philadelphia, May, A. D., 1784, and in their appointment of “a standing committee of the Episcopal Church in this State,” authorizing them “to correspond and confer with representatives of the Episcopal Church in the other States, or any of them, and

assist in framing an ecclesiastical government;" that a voluntary meeting of Clergymen deputed by the Churches in the States assembled (p. 50), in New York, October 6th, 1784, who recommended to the States represented, and proposed to those not represented to organize and associate themselves in the States to which they respectively belonged, agreeably to such rules as they shall think proper, and that these "all should unite in a general Ecclesiastical Constitution;" that in 1785, delegates from seven States met in Philadelphia (p. 57), when the draft of an Ecclesiastical Constitution was submitted, read by paragraphs, and ordered to be transcribed; that the second General Convention (p. 58), met in 1786, when the Constitution was taken up and debated, and with alterations unanimously adopted; that this did not become the fundamental law of the whole Church, the eleventh article providing, that "The Constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, when ratified by the Church in a majority of the States assembled in General Convention, with sufficient power for the purpose of such ratification shall be unalterable by the Convention of any particular State which hath been represented at the time of such ratification;" that this Convention by resolution recommended, "that the several State Conventions do authorize and empower the deputies to the next General Convention after we shall have obtained a Bishop or Bishops in our Church to confirm or ratify a General Constitution respecting both the doctrine and discipline of the Protestant Episcopal Church;" that the next General Convention met in July, 1789, (three Bishops having been in the meantime consecrated,) when the Constitution having been referred to a committee of one from each State was adopted, and August 8th was signed by the members of the Convention; that the Convention adjourned (p. 59,) to September 29th, 1789, at which adjourned session, after certain alterations had been made in the Constitution it was signed by Bishop Seabury and the deputies from Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New Hampshire, whereupon "the union of the Churches was consummated."

Now this instruction seems to us all good and direct. It leads to one point, that the Church of England in the colonies followed the principle of the English Church, and when, in the course of Divine Providence the colonies became severally independent of

the English Government, the Church in each independent State was, and considered itself independent in point of Ecclesiastical government of the Church in every other State. Being each without a Bishop they sought the Episcopate from the mother Church, some at once and directly, and others slowly and mediately. Three Bishops being once in the country, the churches in the several States concluded the negotiations which had been for some time pending, and acting through their representatives appointed for the purpose, adopted a constitution, which was intended to be the fundamental law of the new government, and which established the General Convention as the supreme legislative body in the Church. Yet, the writer not content with this seems to study to ignore, and make the student ignorant of, the existence of the Dioceses as the powers by whom this general ecclesiastical government was established. His great point, repeated again and again, is, that the constitution was adopted by the convention without recourse to the Dioceses; that Bishop White says that the plan of reference to the Dioceses for approval was found so full of difficulties that from 1786 the plan was abandoned; that the constitution was amended without recourse to the Dioceses. But he himself repeats, also, that the deputies to the convention of 1789 came authorized and prepared according to the recommendation of the Convention of 1786, to ratify a constitution. Who deputed these deputies? Whom did these representatives represent? Whence did they derive their "plenipotentiary powers?" The theory of the Manual seems to be that they represented not severally their constituents the Dioceses, but in a body the congregations, the clergy and laity in the United States, and the writer appears only just to fall short of the point of declaring that they so represented the Episcopal Church, that their acts were binding on all the clergy and laity in the United States, irrespective of diocesan action. The student is taught that in 1789 the constitution was established, ratified, adopted and amended, *by the whole Church assembled in general convention*, (p. 63); he is not taught what the expression "whole Church" in this place means. He is rather led to infer that the whole Church means the Church which (p. 43) became independent of the government of the Church of England; had formerly been under the Episcopal direction of the Bishop of London; which after the independence of the States

found itself (p. 44) in a condition of ecclesiastical independence without any episcopal head. But if this inference should be correctly drawn from the Manual, then its teaching (p. 63) is not true. The constitution was neither "established, ratified, adopted," nor "amended by the whole Church assembled in General Convention." It was amended, as the same page shows, without the co-operation of the Eastern churches, which, according to the inference, were a part of the "whole Church," and thus a further inference might be drawn (perhaps the author would like to have it drawn) that the convention which represented the middle and southern Dioceses was the whole Church in council, and had power to give the law to the whole Church in all the Dioceses. "The constitution" (p. 63) "was complete and sovereign on the 8th of August, A. D., 1789." Sovereign over what? Certainly not over the whole Church in the sense in which that term seems to be used, because (p. 59) it was not until Oct. 2, 1789 that the constitution (having been amended as a condition precedent) was signed by Bishop Seabury, and the deputies from Connecticut, Massachusetts and New Hampshire, who were certainly part of the whole Church in that sense. And the fact that they declined their assent until a certain amendment was made, shows what their judgment of the sovereignty of this constitution was. The truth is, that the constitution was sovereign, if the writer chooses to use an expression not particularly applicable to a written constitution, just in this sense, that it was binding upon the Dioceses who had sent deputies, by whose acts in adopting a constitution, they had agreed to be bound, and upon no other Dioceses and no other churches in other Dioceses. If the writer wished to establish the fact that the Dioceses so represented were bound by the constitution because they had agreed to be bound by it, and had authorized their deputies to bind them, why not say so? If he wished to call attention to the fact that the Dioceses gave their deputies plenary powers, and did not reserve to themselves the right of a subsequent ratification of that which they had ratified in advance—in other words, that the authority of the Dioceses to form a union by consent was exercised once instead of twice, why not do it? The whole truth might have been stated in two, as well as in a score of pages, and once as well as a dozen times.

It is the continual serving up of this idea in different forms that

has a tendency to confuse, and we think will confuse, the minds of students. If the Dioceses had not empowered their deputies to bind them by the constitution of 1789 probably the writer would not undertake to say that they would have been bound by that constitution without subsequent ratification, any more than by that of 1786 or 1785, which he allows to have been without binding authority. The whole point of the matter, which Bishop White's continually recurring remark proves, is, that the interfering instructions of the different delegates made it so hard a matter to adopt a constitution which satisfied all the Dioceses, that the Dioceses themselves gave up this plan, and sent their delegates in 1789, telling them in effect to make the best constitution they could. The delegates of 1786 recommended the Dioceses to act upon this plan and give up the former plan, and so they did. But here were the diocesan independence, power and consent; nor does it matter a straw except as a fact of history whether they yielded their obedience by consent to a constitution already made, or to one which was to be made by those whom they appointed for that purpose. And as a matter of history the fact might have been stated, we venture to think, much more simply and much more plainly. The writer evidently had a theory in his mind which he could not bear to allow the facts to crowd out, and so the facts are re-arranged, and re-stated; and apparently, though we do not mean to say intentionally, the student of the Manual is left to gather this theory, though the writer does not venture distinctly to affirm it. He states the point of the matter well, (p. 65).

2. What was the authority of the constitution (as amended in General Convention, October, A. D., 1789), in those States which had not sent deputies, or which had not "empowered" them to "confirm and ratify a general constitution?"

But he does not meet it as he states it. The answer should have been "*none at all.*" Instead of giving that answer, he gives a response one page in length, upon which he next asks, "What further argument may be adduced to prove the supremacy of the General Convention, in respect of amendments to the constitution?" Showing what he was trying to prove, or to let the student believe in the last answer. But what are the facts in that answer? That as the deputies from Connecticut and Massachusetts had not been empowered (p. 66) as the others had, "it was deemed necessary

and proper to refer the constitution of October, A. D., 1789, thus amended, to the Church in Connecticut, for ratification, which was done," 1790-2. That the churches of Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Rhode Island, (whose representatives had signed the constitution without full power to bind them) being separately organized, united themselves in a Diocese, or Province with a distinct convention which took a vote upon the adoption of the constitution, and adopted it, and that accordingly the churches of these three States came into the union "in like manner as any other Diocese has subsequently come in, by acceding to the general constitution by a positive act." Now it seems to us that the cause of truth would not have been injured if the student had been taught simply that the constitution making the General Convention the supreme legislative power is in force in those Dioceses which have consented to it, whether, as in fact, they consented to it in advance or subsequently. Then as a matter of history it would have been well to inform the student *once*, that certain churches did consent in advance, and certain others did consent subsequently.

The theory of the writer comes out in another argument (p. 79) that the supremacy of General Convention is further confirmed by the fact that August 7th, 1789, the General Convention adopted ten canons, which were ordered to be signed before the adoption of the Constitution. But what does that fact show more than the others? Deputies empowered to bind Dioceses by the adoption of a Constitution were certainly empowered to bind them by canons which were a part of the system of united government, and which, whether passed before or after the Constitution, fell into their natural place in the legal system. The Professor would hardly teach that these canons were unconstitutional. In point of fact they derive their authority from the power entrusted by their Dioceses to their deputies and from the subsequent consent of Dioceses to the Constitution, which in principle is the fundamental organic law which canons more definitely apply. In new and trying circumstances some want of system is intelligible and excusable. But the fact that deputies with primary powers to effect a united ecclesiastical government passed canons before they concluded the Constitution does not affect the true legal relation of their acts, neither does it show that the Convention had any powers except those which were conferred upon it by the consent

of the Dioceses who were represented in it. Dioceses which subsequently came into union consented to submit to the Constitution, and of course to constitutional canons.

A good deal of the same ground is tediously gone over (p. 67) and repeated (p. 185) in the questions on the power of amendment. It is perfectly plain from the Constitution (Art. IX.) that it is the Protestant Episcopal Church which has the power to amend and alter the Constitution. It is also perfectly plain that the General Convention, which is the supreme legislative body in that Church, has not the power to do it of its own motion. General Convention, doing so, would alter, without consulting the Dioceses, the basis upon which they have consented to obey the General Convention. To prevent this, the Dioceses agree as the foundations of their obedience that they shall be consulted before such an alteration is made, and the Constitution requires that an amendment shall be proposed in one General Convention, referred to the Diocesan Conventions, and passed by next General Convention. In the intervening three years the Dioceses, in other words, are to determine whether they will agree to be bound by that amendment. Their deputies elected with knowledge of the pending question are sent to the next General Convention. If the majority of the Dioceses, through their deputies in that Convention, reject the amendment, it does not prevail; if they assent to it they are bound by it—by *consent*. The minority also are bound by it, even voting against it—not because of the inherent and sovereign powers of the General Convention, but because of the conferred and delegated powers of the General Convention; in other words, because the Dioceses in a minority have by their assent to the Constitution given up the right to refuse obedience to that which the majority of the Dioceses through their constitutionally authorized organ, the General Convention, agree to enact. Undoubtedly it is the Church in Convention which amends, but it is also the Church in a majority of Dioceses in Convention. It is so because the Constitution makes it so; and if the Dioceses are in union by their consent to obey a Constitution, it certainly is no more than reasonable that the bond of union should not be altered without their consent, or without the consent of that majority which they all agree should have power to alter it. Now the following questions and answers (p. 185–6) seem to us trifling:

Q. For what purpose is the proposed amendment "made known"?

A. The purpose is to acquaint the "Church in each Diocese" with the proposed alteration, that they may not be taken by surprise, and may take action on the subject, if they see fit.

Q. What action in the premises may the Church in a Diocese take?

A. They may elect deputies, with instructions to act or not as they see fit, or they may acquiesce in silence.

Q. If a majority of Diocesan Conventions should approve a proposed amendment, what then?

A. The General Convention ought to give due weight to their objections, but be not otherwise influenced by them. The Diocesan Convention had no voice in the making of the Constitution, and can have no voice in the altering of it, which is tantamount to making a new article.

And then, of course, poor Bishop White is summoned up again like Samuel at Endor, to say that the Constitution was not submitted to the States for ratification, and, furthermore, that "the system of taking measures in General Convention to be reviewed and authoritatively judged of in the bodies of which they were deputies, proved to be futile, and was so fruitful of discord and disunion that it was abandoned from that time"—of the General Convention of A. D. 1786. Now, if the testimony of Bishop White had been adduced to show that the Diocesan Conventions had no power to object to an amendment after it had been adopted in General Convention by the Church in a majority of the Dioceses according to Art. IX., it would have been to the point. But to adduce it to show that the Dioceses have no voice in the amendment of the Constitution, which was created by their consent, and which expressly requires an amendment to be submitted to them, and to have the assent of a majority of them before it can take effect, seems to us to be unnecessarily disquieting the venerable prelate. The plain teaching of the questions and answers is that the Dioceses may take what action they see fit, but the General Convention is to disregard them, and take action as it sees fit. Now, the General Convention, which is elected after a proposed amendment, is not necessarily composed of the same members as that which proposed the amendment. It is composed of members elected by the Diocesan Conventions (p. 92) during the pending of the question of amendment. To say that the General Convention is to give due weight to the objections of the Diocesan Conventions, but be not otherwise influenced by them, is a vague expression.

If the Manual means that the Diocesan delegates who constitute the General Convention have a right and are bound to disobey the directions of the Diocesan Conventions which appointed them, then it assumes what it should have proved. If the delegates who compose the General Convention choose to disregard their obligations to their principles and disobey the directions of those by whom they are commissioned, that is a matter for them to settle with their Dioceses. The General Convention has nothing to do with it. In that body the members represent the Dioceses, and the utmost that can be said is that the assent of the Dioceses is presumed from the action of their deputies. If the deputies of a majority of Dioceses vote for the amendment it is adopted; if not, it is rejected. Why not so teach the student? Are not these questions and answers at least confusions to the student, especially as they follow direct upon a statement like this quoted (p. 184) from Judge Hoffman: "The Dioceses act in General Convention through their delegates; there must be a majority of the Dioceses in union to effect a change in the Constitution."

But our comments upon the Manual have grown to greater length than we intended. We must take leave of it. In conclusion, however, we must advert to the other point of the charge which we feel constrained to make against the Manual, interesting and valuable as in many points it is. The theory which appears to underlie this part of the work, as we said, seems to us not only to be unsustained by the facts, but also to be unchurchly in principle. It rests upon the assumption that the churches—*i. e.* the clergy and congregations—in all the States were the general body which gave being to the Constitution, and to the union of which that Constitution is the fundamental law. The author's own facts seem to us to demonstrate the contrary; they show that throughout, from the beginning to the end, the Church in each State or Diocese was and regarded itself as being ecclesiastically independent of the Church in every other State or Diocese, as of the mother Church of England; that some of them were duly organized in themselves by the consecration of a Bishop before the Constitution was adopted, and that others were so duly organized after the Constitution was adopted, but that all contemplated such actual organization. The exceptional case of South Carolina,

which, in a temporary fit of spleen, desired to have no Bishop within its borders, proves nothing to the contrary. South Carolina in due time, like the rest, was duly organized, or otherwise never could have continued to be a Diocese of the Church. On what principle was it that the Bishops were first elected and consecrated? Was it on the principle that they were to have jurisdiction over all the clergy and congregations in this country in communion with the Church of England, or was the jurisdiction of each Bishop determined by the independence of the Diocese which elected him and for which he was consecrated? The Bishops of course were consecrated with a view to give the succession to the Church of Christ in this country, but when consecrated their jurisdiction was determined by their connection with the separate Dioceses over which they independently presided. They united in consecrating other Bishops who were settled over Dioceses which before had been imperfectly organized. The Church in each State was quite free to send abroad its Bishops elect for consecration, but they naturally preferred to attain the same end without such unnecessary trouble and expense. But the Church in each State became independent with the State, and from the free and independent action of these several Churches, one in communion, but many in point of ecclesiastical government, came the union which resulted in the establishment of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, upon the basis upon which it has ever since stood. The supposition that the clergy and congregations throughout the States were in one mass, unorganized and without diocesan independence, is one that would put the Church in this country in an unheard of position. The historical fact of the recognition of the States themselves as independent of each other would of itself carry the independence of the ecclesiastical government of the Church in each State, upon the principles of the Church of England, and as she affirms upon primitive principles. And if in the loss of the Episcopal supervision of the Bishop of London it was true that they lost their only ecclesiastical organization, all that would follow from this would be that it became their duty to go on and make their organization perfect, a duty which in every case was fulfilled. The Manual itself teaches this, affirming (page 132) that the bounds of Dioceses were determined in this Church by the independence of

the Colonies: "When the Colonies became independent States, the Church in each State became a distinct Church." But yet it teaches that the Church in each Diocese represented in General Convention are "the clergy and laity distributed in the parishes or congregations of each Diocese; for the whole system of the organization of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States is *representative*; except the Bishops, who, by virtue of consecration (see office of consecration of Bishops), are "Bishops in the Church of God" and do not "represent" the Church in their Dioceses in General Convention, but take their seats in the House of Bishops *virtute officii*; and (p. 94) that "the parish or congregation, consisting of minister and people, is the *organic* unit of representation of the Church in each Diocese." Now, if the teaching were only that the House of clerical and lay deputies represented the clerical and lay interest, so to speak, in the several Dioceses, perhaps no objection need be taken to it, but to except the Bishops from the representative system is in keeping with the author's indistinctly developed theory, but not with the facts taught in the Manual. The system is undoubtedly representative, but it is representative of the entire Church in each Diocese. The General Convention is therefore composed of Bishops, clergy, and laity from each Diocese, in order that it may entirely represent the Church in each Diocese. In truth, the organic unit of representation in the general government of the Protestant Episcopal Church is the Diocese; the aggregation of units constitutionally united is the Protestant Episcopal Church.* If there is no Church without a Bishop, neither is there any Bishop with lawful jurisdiction without a Church, and in every duly organized Diocese there is a Church whole and complete, as much a Church as was in the beginning the Church of Ephesus, or of Crete. With a wisdom which they were taught by the Divine grace these Churches in the United States have united themselves under a common form of government, but while every respect is to be paid to that government, and every means should be used to teach the rising generation of the clergy their lesson of due submission to it, yet

*Delegates to the General Convention are chosen, not by the different parts of a Diocese, but by the whole Diocese (p. 92).

The component parts of this common government are Churches, not individuals nor congregations.

nothing should be suffered to obscure the truth that this form of government which we call the Protestant Episcopal Church, which has a Constitution and a supreme General Convention, is an institution of human invention and establishment, which did not bring into being and cannot prevent the existence of the several branches of the Catholic Church which in their divinely assisted wisdom have seen fit to establish and uphold it.

In reviewing this work we have certainly intended to attribute to the learned Professor none but the highest purposes. We venture to think that the opinion which his Book in a manner represents, is not the one which has the right on its side, and our words have been suggested simply by the desire to direct the attention of those who are unprejudiced to certain erroneous principles which are often quietly assumed to be true, and which, by reason of confident assertion, have almost as much weight among men as if they were really true. We pretend to no infallibility, but we write in the hope that what is said in all good feeling and godly sincerity may stimulate fair investigation, and tend to the clearer knowledge of the truth.

ART. III.—THE DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARIST.

THERE is a class of writers in the Anglican Communion (and they number among them men both pious and able), who teach that the Lord's Supper is different from, and superior to, every other act of religion, in its very *nature*. The distinction drawn by them is, that, whereas, in all other religious actions (*i. e.* in Confirmation, or in Baptism) there is a presence of Christ, in this Sacrament alone there is a peculiar and ineffable *union* with Him. This teaching is based on what must appear a misunderstanding of a single text (1 Cor. x. 16). They admit, as they are constrained to do, that in the words, "This bread is my Body"—"This wine is my Blood"—the substantive verb "is" is used in a figurative sense. In examining the disputations of Cranmer with his Popish adversaries we are struck with what impartiality must consider the silly and blind pertinacity with which the advocates of transubstantiation insist upon the literal meaning of "is" here,

as if this verb were never used in Scripture except as a copula to link the subject and predicate. If the literal meaning of "is" be pressed, we make St. Luke affirm, that the wine is the New Testament, which is an effectual *reductio ad absurdum* of the Roman theory. Most evidently the Scriptural use of "is" is often figurative, as in the words, "The Seed is the word of God,"—"The harvest is the end of the world," where the meaning is, the seed *represents* the word of God, the harvest *represents* the end of the world. That School of theologians alluded to, admit, therefore, that "is" is figurative in the words, "This is my Body, &c.;" because there is no possible escape from this figurative interpretation, except in the monstrosity of sheer transubstantiation. They grant also that in St. Paul's celebrated words—"The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion (communication) of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the Communion (communication) of the body of Christ?"—the language is figurative; for in the next verse the Apostle speaks of the bread, after consecration, as being still bread, saying: "For we all are partakers of that one *bread*." But they hold that St. Paul's words, just quoted, teach that the Bread and Wine, being consecrated, are the media of conveying to the faithful recipient the very Body and Blood of Christ in some awful and mysterious manner, which it is beyond the power of human reason to comprehend, and which therefore human reason cannot define. Upon the authority of St. Paul's language in this single text, as they interpret it, that the consecrated bread is the Communion, communication, or means of communicating the body of Christ, &c.,—they teach that a real, exterior presence of the Body and Blood of Christ stands connected with the elements; and that he who communicates faithfully receives this Body and Blood—not carnally, they take care to add, but none the less really. It is extremely difficult—we may say, impossible—to locate with precision the position taken by these theologians,—the terms they use are so mystical and bewildering. We can understand what transubstantiation means; and we can realize what the spiritual presence of Christ is. Their position is somewhere between these two points. They teach that the participation of the elements carries with it a communication of the Body and Blood of Christ, not in a material sense, yet in a sense above that of a simple spiritual presence.

This evidently appears from the fact, that they make the Eucharist to be superior to every other act of religion, not in degree merely, but in nature: That whereas there is in all other religious actions (as in Baptism) a presence of Christ, there is in this Sacrament alone a mysterious and incomprehensible *union* with Him.

The consequences of such teachings are two-fold. In the first place, it is not only an error in itself, and an error upon a deeply important point, but the whole "proportion of faith" is disturbed thereby. The law of adjustment holds here as in things material. If a fluid be depressed at one point, there is a corresponding elevation at another: or if there be an unnatural elevation in one part, an unnatural depression takes place in some other. And if this Sacrament be taken out of its place, and advanced beyond the truth of its position, the other portions of the Christian system are thereby correspondingly depressed and thrown into the shade, and the symmetry of the whole destroyed. The honor of that which is really worthy of honor, is alone due to the simple truth of its nature. It is, therefore, not to honor the Sacrament, but to dishonor it, to assign it a status which is unwarranted and untrue.

Another consequence is, that such a view in regard to this Sacrament stands connected with the rise and progress of Ritualism, that millstone round the neck of the Church. The roots of Ritualism are embedded in unhealthy teachings as to the nature of Sacramental grace. The Sacraments do undoubtedly confer grace. This must be owned by all who are not biased by the pride of controversy, or the prepossessions of party. But there are, as has just been pointed out, unhealthy teachings in regard to the nature of this grace, and doubtless it is upon such teachings that the excrescence of Ritualism is mainly bottomed; for if there be in Ritualism nothing beyond an excess of ornament and gesture, if it does not stand connected with doctrine as its representative and symbol, it is the merest child's play, unworthy the thought of serious and earnest men—a gaudy bubble, which, encountering the opposition it has done, would have exploded almost as soon as it began to float.

To return to St. Paul's text (1 Cor. x. 16,) upon which too much is made to hang.—In the interpretation of the Apostle's language we should adopt the obvious and true import, that the Com-

munion or communication of Christ's Body and Blood in the Sacrament, is the communication of the *efficacy* of His Body and Blood. He who consults Cranmer in his disputation with Chedsey, or in his answer to Gardiner, will see that this is the understanding of the man who did more than any other to shape the Reformed Anglican Liturgy; and that this is the meaning of our American Prayer Book ought to be owned by all, who, freed from party prepossessions, interpret its offices fairly, by the light of Scripture and the opinions of the Reformers. When in the xxviiith Article it is said "The bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ"—when in the Catechism it is said, that the inward part or thing signified in the Sacrament is "the Body and Blood of Christ"—when in the prayer of consecration the invocation runs, that we "may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood"—in these places, and in all such places, by the Body and Blood of Christ is meant the *efficacy* of His Body and Blood, or the efficacy of His passion, death, and meritorious sacrifice.

What, then, is the efficacy of the Body and Blood of Christ? This efficacy is of a twofold character. First, it determines certain acts of God *towards* us—Secondly, it conveys a certain influence from God *into* us. These acts of God towards us are pardon and adoption, which the Divine Being confers upon those who believe. This influence from God which passes into us (and the issue is as to what *passes into us* in the reception of the Eucharist) is the Spirit of Jesus Christ. When in the Sacrament we are said to receive the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, as of something which passes into us, the meaning must be, that we receive the efficacy of His Body and Blood—that is to say, the Spirit of Christ, that Spirit which the Blood of Christ purchased, that Spirit which to us is the one thing needful, and which it is the great design of Christianity, with its system of means, to convey. Whatever may be those affections of God towards us set in motion by the devout celebration of this Sacrament, that alone which it is the means of conveying into us, which man needs to receive, which he can receive, and which, since God stands pledged to bestow it, he does receive, is the Spirit of Jesus Christ, or the Holy Ghost, our Sanctifier and Comforter.

God has, once for all, delivered unto us His message in the

Scriptures, whereof the sum is, that man has sinned and that Christ has died. That we may savingly comprehend this message, He likewise imparts to us His Spirit. His Spirit passes into us, as air passes into the lungs, and is the sole, independent author of faith, and of that entire train of Christian graces, of which faith itself is the head and source. The analysis of faith, whereon all subjective religion is bottomed, shows it to be a complex grace, since by it the objects of religious belief are apprehended to be, first, true—secondly, good. The apprehension of these things as being true, is simply a mental process, resting for its basis either upon authority, or upon an independent examination of the primary evidences of Christianity. But the further and necessary apprehension of the objects of belief as being good and acceptable, is the gift of God to those who ask and seek. In other words, it is the result of the Holy Spirit on the affections and will, causing them to embrace as being good, that message from God which the mind apprehends as being true. The Father through the merit of our crucified and glorified Saviour, distributes this Spirit into every part of the moral universe. Our Lord died on the cross for the sins of the world. Rising from the grave, He instituted His Church, and provided for its perpetuation. Having done this, He has retired for a season into the Heavens, and from His throne there watches over His Church, and refreshes it with showers of His grace—that grace or Spirit which is the source of every heavenly affection, and therefore the efficient cause of Salvation—which is the interior hidden life of the Christian Church, and which is communicated to the individual members thereof through the use of certain appointed means, properly called means of grace.

At the head of these means, stands confessedly, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. As Christianity is a system of means for recovering man from the consequences of sin, at the head of which stands the death and sacrifice of Christ—so the Christian Church is a system of means for applying Christianity to the individual soul at the head of which stands the corresponding Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. But this Sacrament, as a means of grace, does not differ from other means of grace in its nature, but simply in its degree. Exalted above the rest, it is yet a means of conveying *into us* the Spirit of Christ, and no more. The *nature* of Christ's

presence in the Eucharist is precisely that of His presence in Baptism, or in any other means of grace; for as Cranmer says in the preface to his answer to Gardiner, "no more is Christ really present in the due ministration of the Lord's Supper, than He is in the due ministration of Baptism—that is to say, in both Spiritually by grace." But the channel of grace is widened, as the activity and power of faith are augmented; and the superiority of the Lord's Supper among the ordinances of religion, grows out of its nature to stimulate faith, which constitutes our receptivity for grace. This Sacrament presents a cluster of striking features, having a direct tendency to powerfully rouse and intensify the principle of faith, and rendering it the first in dignity and importance among Christian actions.

First, it is a sign of the unity and love which ought to obtain among Christians. Christians bear a certain relation to each other, growing out of a common relation to Christ, just as patriots bear a certain relation to one another, growing out of a common relation to their country—whereof the mathematical representation is a triangle. The character of this relation is beautifully signified in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. One loaf, divided and distributed among many communicants, is indicative of this unity in Christ, and of this obligation to love one another, growing out of that unity. Again, the circumstances surrounding the Eucharist are peculiarly solemn and affecting. Instituted in the darkest and saddest hour of His life, when the shadow of the cross lay athwart His soul; it is the legacy of a dying Saviour, and stands associated with the most profound and touching sentiments of the Christian heart. And, again, it was instituted for the very purpose of representing and being a memorial of the central and most significant event in our Lord's history, His Death, and of conveying to us the benefits of the same. Therefore, there is no act of worship so calculated to raise up in the soul sentiments of love and gratitude and affiance and trust towards God, no one which draws around it a Christian atmosphere so invigorating, no one which conveys to the devout worshipper so large an amount of grace, so much of strength and refreshment. If there be ever a moment when faith is powerfully aroused, when there is on our part a receptivity for grace, and when grace is conveyed in a stream rich and full, it is when the believer kneels before Christ's minister to receive the Sacramental elements. A vivid picture of Christ's

Death is before him. The words authoritatively pronounced over him—This is my Body which is given for you, This is my Blood which is shed for you—vibrate through all his soul. He is alive with a trembling adoration—faith is powerfully quickened—the soul opens wide towards God—and the grace of Christ, passing into him, carries strength and refreshment to the Spiritual life.

Of Christian actions, therefore, the Eucharist is the first in dignity and importance, the most solemn and the most sanctifying. But as it is in circumstance and ceremonial before all other acts of religion only in kind, so its benefits are greater only in kind also. Its superiority is that of degree, not of nature. Neither does Scripture, nor do our offices, support the position—endorsed though it be, by some great and venerated names—that, whereas there is a presence of Christ in all other Christian actions, there is in the Eucharist alone an awful and incomprehensible union with Him, through that Body and Blood which the elements are the medium of conveying to us. We will not trouble our readers with a discussion about names. We may say of the Spiritual life, or of the use of the means by which that life is invigorated, that it involves either a presence of Christ or a union with Christ whichever we please. What we object against as unwarrantable and mischievous teaching, is the ascribing an effect to one Sacrament different in its *nature* from the effect of the other. For this there is no authority. The words of Cranmer—and the language of this great Reformer is so often invoked because of the leading influence exerted by him in moulding our Liturgy—are true, and need to be heeded in these days, “that wheresoever in the Scriptures it is said, that Christ, God, or the Holy Ghost is in any man the same is understood spiritually by grace,” and again (to make a repetition), “no more is Christ really present in the due ministration of the Lord’s Supper, than He is in the due ministration of Baptism, that is to say, in both spiritually by grace.” These are the plain words of Cranmer, and they are the sum of his teachings on the subject. Indeed, they are expressly affirmed by himself to be the test by which all his teaching in regard to the nature of the Eucharist, is to be tried. His affirmation is, then, that the efficacy or benefit of the two Sacraments do not differ in their nature. Cranmer held the truth of Scripture; and the spirit of his teachings stand embodied in the offices of our Book of Common Prayer.

Let the Holy Eucharist receive all honor. But it is not to honor it, but to dishonor it, to attempt by a mystical argument to take it out of its place and connections, and affirm that in regard to it, of which neither Scripture is the teacher, nor the Church the witness. A morbid sentimentalism has seized upon such teaching, developed it to the verge of transubstantiation, and made use of Ritualism to symbolize and represent it. It is such erroneous teachings which vitalize this excrescence upon the Church, an excrescence that has been allowed to mend its hold by what we are pained to declare a laxity in the administration of discipline on the part of some of our chief pastors, and the timidity displayed by the late General Convention. It is earnestly to be hoped that this timidity will not characterize the approaching meeting of that body. The man who makes but half a leap falls into the ditch. Let the next General Convention, in the consciousness of strength, by a bold and righteous spring clear the abyss. However stoutly its adherents may deny the charge, it cannot be disguised, that the effect of Ritualism is to create a certain drift towards an erroneous and hostile system, and establish certain affinities with that system, which require to be promptly checked. Against the errors of that system we appear on record as uttering a formal and solemn protest; and if there were solid reasons for this protest when the XXXIX Articles were drawn up, there are more solid reasons for reaffirming and continuing it now, since Rome has abated none of its arrogance, while it has multiplied its errors. With this monstrous system which exhibits the abnormal spectacle of decrepitude at its centre, and activity at its extremities—Ritualism has undoubtedly certain affinities—not to the extent in which they are believed to exist in the popular apprehension, yet still in a certain sense truly existing. The roots of Ritualism are nourished by unhealthy teachings in regard to the Eucharist. Fair discussion may do much to correct such teachings. But something more would appear to be needed. Let the next Convention take hold of the general subject, and answer the expectations of the true friends of the Church. And if there be issues whereon a General Convention may be incompetent to act, let there be a call for a Pan Anglican Synod, to settle them, to the end that the Church may have peace, that distrust in regard to her may be dispelled, and the way for her enlargement free.

ART. IV.—THE COUNCIL OF JERUSALEM.

PERHAPS no event connected with the polity of the early Church deserves more attention than the Council of Jerusalem. As much may be learned of the system of government, the office and functions of rulers and members, and the general characteristics of that polity, from a careful examination of this assembly and its acts, as from any single occurrence in the New Testament. It involves also collateral points of deep interest, which may be appropriately investigated. It will confirm the primitive character of the Protestant Episcopal Church in our own country and of the Church of England, rejecting her Erastianism in material matters. The discussion will have more important results, connected with Gospel truths, than its mere historical interest. Yet that would be sufficient of itself, to commend it to every student of the New Testament.

The history of the Council is given in the fifteenth chapter of Acts.

It was held about the year A. D., 51, and was primarily a judicial tribunal. It was convened to settle a point which had been the subject of disagreement at Antioch, viz., whether the Gentile Proselytes were to be circumcised. The same question was raised by certain Pharisees at Jerusalem.

That the Apostle Paul alone, or, with his associate in the ministry, Barnabas,* could have decided this matter, so far at least as to control the practice at Antioch, cannot be questioned. But it was a point of great importance for all the converts from the Gentile world. It was referred therefore to the Council, at Jerusalem, to decide it primarily and ultimately.

This comprehensive jurisdiction involved the right of revision had the point been first determined at Antioch.

The decision of the question is found in the words, "We will not trouble them" (upon this matter) "which among the Gentiles are turned to God;" and further in the declaration, "We have heard that some have troubled you with words saying,

* See Post, Barnabas.

'you must be circumcised, and keep the law;' to whom we gave no such commandment."

Then followed an act of legislative power. "We will lay no greater burthen upon them than these necessary things, that they should abstain from meats, etc." These were rules for the government of the Proselytes in the future. Thus the Council, in uniting and exercising judicial and legislative power, furnished the model for all such bodies thereafter.

Members. A material inquiry is, who were the members of the council, with a voice in its decisions?

The Apostles.

We find from the narrative, that Peter and James were there. Now of the original twelve, there was then living James, the son of Alphaeus. James, the son of Zebedee, and brother of John, had been before slain by Herod, (Acts xii. 2.) There were then only ten left, Peter, John, Andrew, Philip, Bartholomew, Thomas, Matthew, James the son of Alphaeus, Lebbeus also called Judas, and Simon. It may be assumed that all or the greater part of these were present. At the dispersion consequent upon the death of Stephen, the Apostles continued at Jerusalem, (Acts viii. 1.) This appears to have been for some time, the central point from which they sent forth missionaries to confirm or enlarge the Church elsewhere.

We assume also that Matthias was present, with an equal voice in the Council. He had been substituted in the place of Judas, "who had been numbered with us," and he was "ordained to be a witness with us and to take part of this ministry and Apostleship, from which Judas fell." He was to accomplish the predication "his Bishopric let another take."

In the selection we find that the Apostles named and appointed two, each of whom they deemed fit to be their associate, and then prayed God to declare which of them He had chosen.

Yet the extravagant opinion has been advocated that in this transaction, the Apostles audaciously usurped authority. That is to say, they began their career after the Ascension, by an act of treason, and made it more odious by an act of impiety.

Great stress is laid upon the fact, that the person to be chosen should be one who was to be a witness with them of the Resurrection. This has led to the supposition that Matthias was one of the Seventy. Their commission was given soon after that

of the Apostles, confessed similar powers.* Eusebius says, Matthias also, he who was enrolled as an Apostle in place of the traitor Judas, and the other Barsabas or Justus, who with Matthias was honored with an equal suffrage, it is reported (*fama est*) was of this body of the Seventy Disciples. (*Hist. Lib. 1, Cap. 12.*)

St. Jerome declares that Matthias, who had been one of the Seventy, was chosen into the order of the eleven Apostles.

St. James. Dr. Hammond considers that James, the Lord's brother, Bishop of Jerusalem, and sometimes called the thirteenth Apostle, was present and delivered the final Judgment.†

It is, however, the opinion of a number of writers, that this was James the Less, or younger son of Alpheus, and one of the twelve. Mary, his mother, and wife of Cleophas, (Alpheus) stood by the Cross at the crucifixion. (St. John xix. 25.) Paphias, considered to have been a disciple of St. John, speaks of the Virgin, and then of the wife of Cleophas or Alpheus, who was the mother of James, the Bishop and Apostle. Ignatius calls St. Stephen the Deacon of James.

But Hegesippus writes, "James, the Lord's brother, who was surnamed of all men the Just, undertook, together with the Apostles, the government of the Church at Jerusalem."

St. Jerome says, James was ordained by the Apostles, Bishop of Jerusalem, immediately after the crucifixion. St. Cyril, the Bishop of Jerusalem, A. D., 349, speaks of James as the first Bishop of that diocese. Eusebius writes that James was placed of the Apostles, Bishop of Jerusalem. And the Continental Reformer Buddæus says, "The ancients with one consent declare that a certain James was over the Church at Jerusalem at this time, as a Bishop." ‡

Barrow observes, "The greater consent of the most ancient writers making St. James not to have been one of the twelve Apostles, it is thence accountable why St. James was called by some ancient writers the Bishop of Bishops, the Prince of Bishops, because he was the first Bishop of the first See, the Mother Church, the Apostles being excluded from the comparison." (*On the Supremacy, p. 136, Oxford, 1852.*)

* See Post, Elders.

† Notes on Acts xv. and on Galatians ii. 1.

‡ Preface to Latin Translation of Bingham, Vol. 2, p. 4. The above authorities are taken partly from Marshall's Notes on Episcopacy, 384 to 387, and partly from Bingham, Antiq. J., p. 54, &c. See also Potter's Church Government, 72, n.

And here the Apostolical Constitutions as they are termed, furnish valuable testimony. It seems now generally conceded, that they are as old as the fourth century, and are available as evidence of received customs, traditions, and tenets. See Professor Krabbe's *Essay*, Chase's *Translation*, New York, 1848. He collects the opinions of perhaps every noted writer, and shows a remarkable coincidence as to the date of the complete work being early in the fourth century.

"The first seven books bear in a high degree the impress of the age of Cyprian, and have proceeded upon his spirit and aim." In the 12th Constitution of the Sixth Book, it is stated :

"We, the twelve, being assembled at Jerusalem, (for Matthias was chosen to be an Apostle in the room of the betrayer, and took the lot of Judas) deliberated, together with James, the Lord's brother, what was to be done; and it seemed good to him, and to the Elders, to speak to the people words of doctrine. The brethren who were at Antioch sent forth to us men to learn concerning this question. These declared to us what questions had arisen in the Church of Antioch. And when some said one thing and some another, St. Peter stood up, and said to them, &c. But James the Lord's brother answered and said, &c.

"Then it seemed good to us the Apostles, and to James, the Bishop, and to the Elders, with the whole Church to send men chosen from among ourselves, with Barnabas and Paul of Tarsus, the Apostle of the Gentiles, with Judas, &c. And we wrote by their hand as follows: The Apostles and Elders, &c."

Again in Book II. 55, the call of all men to repentance is spoken of as made after the Saviour's passion by *us*, "the twelve Apostles, and Paul the chosen vessel," and,

"We therefore who have been accounted worthy of being the witnesses of His appearance, together with James, the brother of our Lord, and the Seventy-two Disciples, and the seven Deacons, have heard from the mouth of the Lord Jesus, and declare that none should perish, &c."

It at first appeared singular that the phrase, "we the twelve being assembled" should be used, when there were but eleven, James having been slain, but precisely the same phrase is found in First Corinthians, xv. After the resurrection, Christ was seen of Cephas, "then of the twelve." In Mark xvi. it is "afterward he appeared unto the eleven." The term the twelve is used to denote the body collectively.

From all these authorities, the following results may be deduced.

If the James who delivered his opinion as a member of the council was St. James, one of the twelve, his right is plain, and he spoke with at least an equal authority. If however, he was a different person, known as James the brother of the Lord, his station in the Church at Jerusalem was of the highest eminence, and that he should be a member of the council may naturally be supposed.

But, (and this is of importance), his office and power were conferred by, and derived from the Apostles. This the tradition and history of the Church assert. This is a necessary, unexceptionable deduction from Apostolic Supremacy, and except where the Saviour specially intervened, as in the case of St. Paul, this Supremacy is an absolute, fundamental doctrine of the New Testament.

So there is no inconsistency, and no infringement of a doctrine never to be forgotten or weakened, in supposing that St. James, the Bishop of Jerusalem was present, announced his judgment, and may have presided at the Council. All was delegated or sanctioned by the eleven, the then sole fountain of power or office.

Was St. Paul a member of this Council? We think the evidence is against the supposition. When St. Paul, after his conversion, came to Jerusalem," he assayed to join himself to the disciples; but they believed not, that he was a disciple. But Barnabas took him, and brought him unto the apostles, and declared unto them, how he had seen the Lord in the way, &c., and he was with them, coming in and going out at Jerusalem." (Acts ix. 26, 28).

It is plain so far, that the original apostles, though they received him, did not recognize him as an equal with themselves at that time.

He was deputed by the brethren at Antioch to go to the Apostles and elders at Jerusalem, about the question. At Jerusalem they (Barnabas and himself) were received of the church, and of the apostles and elders. And the apostles and elders came together to consider the matter.

Thus, the body to which he was sent, and the body which came together is plainly distinct, and did not include St. Paul.

In the council Peter rose up and spoke, as also did James. But the language as to St. Paul is very marked.

"Then all the multitude (the whole Council) kept silence, and gave audience to Barnabas and Paul, declaring, &c."

The change of language is very suggestive. Peter rose up and said. Audience, a hearing of the message and statements carried by St. Paul and Barnabas was given, and given by a distinct body.

The argument of Conybeare and Howson, and the authority of Dr. Davidson, leave little doubt that the visit to Jerusalem referred to in Galatians, chapter ii., was the same as that when the Council was held. * That he went up by revelation, the direction of heaven, as well as a deputy of the church, is proven. It is then remarkable, that not merely is there no suggestion of his being of the Council, but that he speaks of James, Cephas and John, who seemed to be pillars, giving him the right hand of fellowship, implying that his claim as an apostle of equal rank, had not been universally recognized. And again he communicated the Gospel which he preached privately to them of reputation.

Barnabas. If there is reason to doubt St. Paul's being a member, the argument would be no stronger as to Barnabas.

Elders are mentioned as present at the Council, and as a class they had an equal voice with the apostles. Who were they?

The best conclusion is, that they were of the seventy commissioned by our Lord, shortly after the commission to the apostles, and endued with similar powers.

The first notice of Elders is in Acts xiii. 30. The disciples at Antioch sent relief for the brethren in Jerusalem, to the *Elders*, by the hands of Barnabas and Saul. This implies that they were of a known class. The supposition that they were Jewish elders of the synagogue is highly improbable. Mr. Burton's idea that some of the seven deacons are meant has no support in the text, and little in reasoning. †

Again, the mission of Paul and Barnabas was "to the apostles and elders at Jerusalem." (Ch. xv.) They "were received of the church, and of the apostles and elders, about the matter." "The apostles and elders came together to consider the matter."

When St. Paul went up to Jerusalem, he went in with us unto James, and all the elders were present. (Ch. xxi.)

* Davidson's Introduction, vol. II, p. 112 *et Seq.*, and the Apostolical Constitution before quoted (ante, St. James) are of weight upon this question. Certainly the whole statement leads to the result that the members of the Council were the twelve, and James, and the Elders, the assent of the whole Church being added.

† Lectures on the First Three Centuries.

There are many notices of the ordination of elders at various places, such as Lystra, Iconium and Antioch. (Ch. xiv. xxiii.)

Numerous texts speak of elders as a class existing, or to be ordained. The Epistles to Timothy and Titus furnish examples. But there is not a trace of the ordination of elders by any apostle at Jerusalem, or for the church there. When we find this silence, and find a class commissioned by the Saviour, endued with ministerial functions of a high order, without any warrant for supposing their office had been withdrawn, we may well conclude that they were the elders at Jerusalem.*

The commission to the seventy is nearly identical with that to the apostles, in its chief particulars. "He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth Him that sent me." (St. Matthew x. 40.) "He that heareth you heareth me; he that despiseth you despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth Him that sent me." (Luke xv. 16.)

St. Jerome says, that St. Luke the Evangelist attests, that there were twelve apostles and seventy disciples; the one of the higher, the other of the lesser grade; and that St. Paul refers to these two classes when he says, that after the resurrection Christ showed Himself first to the eleven, then to all the apostles. (Appen. Potter's Church Government, 36, n.)

Mr. Selden (*De Synodis Ebræorum*) states that many of the fathers were of the opinion that the elders at the Church of Jerusalem were the seventy, or some of them. Van Espen observes:

"Not only the apostles, but also the seventy disciples whom the Lord sent, He commended, 'Who heareth you, heareth me.' It is to be noted that bishops are the successors of the apostles, and presbyters of the seventy disciples, so that not only to them, but to these also, the faithful should be subject." (Supplement, p. 421, Vind. Rev. Doct. Levani.)

Again,—“After Christ had chosen the twelve apostles and sent them forth as rulers of His future people, He then designated seventy-two disciples, and gave to them, as co-operators with the apostles, power of government in the Church.” †

“It is a beautiful figure of Origen that the apostles were the twelve fountains of Elam, and the seventy, the palm trees on their margins.”

Van Espen cites as authority for his statements, Isidorus, the

* When St. Paul went in unto James, all the Elders were present. (Chap. xxi.)

† Supplement, p. 421, Vindicis Res. Doct. Levani.

Roman Pontifical, and the Council of Aurelians.* Archbishop Potter observes, that Matthias, the person ordained to succeed Judas, if any credit may be given to Eusebius, Jerome, or Epiphanius, was one of the seventy. That Barnabas, Mark, Luke, Sosthenes, and other Evangelists, as also the seven deacons, if the primitive fathers of the Church are to be believed, were also of the seventy. From all which it appears how unreasonable their opinion is, who think that the seventy disciples were of the same order or dignity as the twelve apostles.†

Dr. Crosssthaite, in his edition of Potter's work, adds the text of Eusebius in the Greek, with a Latin translation. (p. 398.) The English translation by Dr. Hammond is as follows: "The names of the apostles are apparent to every one out of the Holy Evangelists; but the catalogue of the seventy disciples is nowhere to be found." (Lib. 2, cap. xiii.)

"Eusebius then enumerates several who were reported to have belonged to that body; Barnabas, Sosthenes, Matthias, Barsabas, and Thaddeus."

Eusebius cannot be understood as meaning that there was literally no list of the seventy extant. He, himself, speaks of Dorotheus, a minister of the Church at Antioch, who died A.D., 366, as one greatly skilled in the Scriptures, and that he had heard him expound. (Ecc. Hist. 7, xxxi.) That Dorotheus wrote a work "of the prophets, apostles, and seventy disciples."‡ His list includes the seven deacons by name. It includes Titus, who certainly was not one, and Timothy, equally to be rejected.

The translator of this work of Dorotheus goes over the catalogue, and compares it with three others which he mentions, one by Petrus de Natalibus, one by Volateran, and another by Demochares. He cites their works by their titles.

I have not been able to find a trace of the period when these authors lived or wrote. Even the list of writers given by Bingham, (*Antiq.* vol. 8, 349, Oxford, 1855) does not contain their names.

* A Gallic Council. There were four of them held at that place (Orleans) from 511 to 549. Bingham, viii. p. 347.

† Church Government, p. 35. London, 1852.

‡ Printed with Eusebius and Socrates in *Ecclesiastical Histories*. London, 1650. The period of Eusebius was from about 270 to 339.

Again, Dr. Crossthwaite states, that there was a catalogue of the seventy contained in a tract concerning the apostles, attributed to St. Hippolitus, and printed in the appendix to the first volume of Fabricius' edition of his works. In this catalogue are found all the names enumerated by Potter. Assuming this writer to have been Hippolitus Portuensis, (and I meet with no other), he lived somewhere between 220 and 386.*

We think that the passage from Eusebius must be considered as referring to a full and authentic record of the names of the seventy, and the Greek and Latin versions in the notes to Archbishop Potter's work are not inconsistent with this view. See the dictionary of Forcellini, the words *percripta* and *præcriptio*, and the word *catalogos* in the Greek Dictionary.

THE LAITY.

It has been asserted that the *laity* were present, and with an equal voice in the decision, and in forming the law promulgated. The question has been long agitated, and involves very important principles.

What does the record show?

(1.) The reference of the question was to the apostles and elders solely. Paul and Barnabas were sent to Jerusalem, to the apostles and elders. The Church assisted them on their way.

(2.) Upon their arrival at Jerusalem they were received of the Church and of the apostles and elders.

(3.) The convocation of those to hear and decide was of the apostles and elders only.

(4.) There was much disputing before Peter rose. The inference is fair, that they who took part in the discussion were of the classes convened.

(5.) The argument was made by St. Peter, that God had put no difference between Jews and Gentiles, but had given the Holy Ghost to all. This checked the discussion and imposed silence.

(6.) Barnabas and Paul gave witness to the truth of Peter's assertion, as to the equality of the Gentiles. James closed the deliberations, citing the prophets to sustain this view, and gave his sentence that the Gentiles were not to be troubled who had turned to God. They were not, as is clearly indicated, to be forced to circumcision. And then, as part of the conclusion arrived at—that we write to them to abstain, etc.

The narrative proceeds: "Then pleased it, the Apostles and Elders, with the whole Church to send chosen men of their own company to Antioch, with Paul and Barnabas, namely, Judas, surnamed Barsabas, and Silas,

* Bingham, 8, p. 268. The translation by Fabricius was printed at Hamburg in 1716.

chief men among the brethren, and they wrote letters by them after this manner :

“The apostles and elders and brethren send greeting unto the brethren, which are of the Gentiles, in Antioch, and Syria, and Cilicia. Forasmuch as *we* have heard that certain, etc., it seemed good unto *us*, being assembled with one accord, to send chosen men unto you with, etc. We have sent therefore Judas and Silas, who shall also tell you the same. For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to *us*, to lay upon you no greater burthen than these necessary things, that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, etc.’ ” *

When all the evidence of this narrative is fully weighed, the best warranted conclusion seems to be, that they who assembled to consider, and did consider and decide, were the apostles and elders; that brethren (laymen) were present; that the determination was perfected before they were noticed; that their approbation and union in the letters announcing the decision, and the further law, was then sought, and such letters, by this invitation and permission, were then sent in the joint name. †

The passage in the ensuing chapter seems to settle the point decisively. Paul and Timothy, on their subsequent journey, “as they went through the cities, delivered the decrees to be kept, which were ordained of the *apostles and elders*, which were at Jerusalem.”

But another argument may be used. The Church in Jerusalem had largely increased in numbers. About seventeen years before the council, one hundred and twenty disciples were assembled. ‡ Three thousand had been added at the Pentecost. A very large number must have resided at Jerusalem. If the power to join in legislation had not been communicated by the apostles to laymen, it could not have existed. To suppose that every convert, on admission by baptism, became for these purposes the equal of the apostles, is most visionary. It overthrows the whole tenet of apostolic superiority. We cannot imagine all the members of the Church at Jerusalem present. There is no trace of a representation. If the whole body were not *ipso facto* members, and some were so, with a voice in the decision, it must have been by

* “And Moses, with the elders of Israel, commanded the people, saying, ‘Keep all the commandments, which I this day command you.’ ”

† Acts xvi. 45.

‡ Acts i. 15.

selection; and none could select but apostles. That is the very principle we contend for. They bestowed authority as they chose, to whom they chose, and to such extent as they chose. They did allow the laity of the Church at Jerusalem to participate in the announcement of the decrees. They gave them a restricted voice, and in this furnished a model for the government of the Church for the future.

There is one distinction which we think controls the question.

A number of able men have supposed that this is a precedent which excludes the laity from the Councils of the Church. * This extreme opinion is as erroneous as the other theory, that the laity were at this first Council endowed with a co-ordinate power. The Divine right of the people is as baseless a notion as the Divine right of kings. The apostles had all power; could confer what they willed and on whom they chose. That, power, except as conventionally modified, devolved upon Bishops. It has always been, and is now competent for them to form a National or other Council, with the laity as advisers or as equals, in matters of discipline and order. The apostles and elders associated the Church (that is, the people) with themselves in promulgating their decrees. They could have done more, but did not. Their successors have done more, and without transgressing apostolic principles. An authority in such matters is communicable with their assent; and incommunicable without it. There are of course limits to such a devolution, because there are some offices exclusively reserved for clerical hands; but we need not dwell on such exceptions.

Upon this great Gospel truth rests the vindication of our Bishops, who, in the year 1789, admitted the laity to a large share of authority in Ecclesiastical Councils. Innumerable Churches scattered over the earth who rise up and call their mother of England blessed, have invoked lay co-operation in their Synods. Yet that great Church, in her hour of trial and peril, fails to strengthen herself with this powerful aid. She has rested upon the reed of royal supremacy until it has pierced her

* Solater, Draught, etc., Keble's Letter in Church Journal of April, 1853, Joyce's Sacred Synods, Dr. Pusey's Councils of the Church, Field of the Church Book, p. 646. On the other side are Mr. Churton, Dean Newman, Synodalia of May, p. 21. See also a paper addressed by the Glasgow Church Institute to the primus of Scotland apud Synodalia

through. Few passages in Church literature have a more solemn and impressive tone than the first ten pages of Dr. Pusey's work on "the Supremacy. We have thought that he must have learned to distrust his own views, as he found developed in the decisions on baptism and the Essays, the principles sown by the fatal act of submission of the clergy in the day of Henry the Eighth. In another work he says: "The Church of England will endure it until injustice shall make it intolerable, or justice shall amend it." Yet he has cast the strength of his talent and learning for the exclusion of the laity from a share in the legislation of the Church. This is to be deplored. Wheresoever the lay element has been introduced it has proved a source of strength and progress. The intelligence, energy, and prudence of her sons would invigorate the English Church in the contest she is waging and is destined to wage. There are predictions of foes and misgivings of friends, as to the future of England's power. A fall or decay of this would be a blow to civilization and freedom over the globe. We will not credit a prophecy so full of evil. But the downfall of the English Church would be a far deadlier wound to the cause of humanity, truth, and religion. Beyond any other influence, the strength of England has arisen from the support of her Church, from the loyalty, fortitude, and truth she has taught; the prayers sent forth from the decks of the warrior vessels whose victories have saved or given her dominion. If her rulers treat that Church with neglect or contumely, despise her liberties, usurp her heaven-descended rights, the hour of England's need will be an hour of despair. It was a coal from the Altar that fired the nest of the eagle, that royal and dominant bird. *

The Romish writers insist that St. Peter was the head of the Council, mainly upon the ground of his speaking first. Some on the other side contend that James possessed the ultimate power of decision, relying upon the words "my sentence is." Not a word in the narrative is inconsistent with the entire equality of the apostles, and Dr. Barrow accurately sums up the whole with the remark that, according to the proposal of St. James, it was by general consent determined to send a decretal letter to the Gentile Christians. *

* South.

† On the Supremacy, p. 65.

Interesting and valuable as is the history of this Council, as to its organization and direct judicial and legislative action, the principles declared of comprehension and Catholicism were of higher importance. No sooner had the door of faith been opened to the Gentiles than a strong opposition and dissension arose. Two parties sprang up in the Church, one chiefly composed of proselytes from Judaism, the other from the Gentiles. The Christians at Jerusalem condemned St. Peter for that he had gone in to men uncircumcised, and eaten with them. * And they of the circumcision which believed were astonished, because on the Gentiles also was poured forth the gift of the Holy Ghost. It is needless to cite passages to prove that the Judaizing teachers held the absolute necessity of obeying the Mosaic law on which Christianity was grafted, and particularly that circumcision was essential. This certain men who went from Judea to Antioch taught the brethren. Then at the Council the great truth was unfolded by Peter, that God had before chosen him, through whom the Gentiles should hear the word of the Gospel, and believe that God had put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith. Adverting to the rigor of the law, he adds, there was a yoke which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear; but through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we as they shall be saved.

James also enforces the argument of Peter, quoting the prophets † to prove that the call of the Gentiles was in fulfilment of the law; that the rebuilding the Tabernacle of David was, that the residue of men might seek the Lord, and all the Gentiles.

From this moment the law was, that in the Christian Church there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bond, nor free; but that Christ is all and in all.

* Acts xi. 3.

† Amos ix. 11, 12.

ART. V.—A CLEMENTINE COMMENT.

The forty-fourth Chapter of the Epistle of St. Clement, Bishop of Rome, to the Church of Corinth. Ante-Nicene Christian Library. S. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1870. New York, Charles Scribner & Co., 654 Broadway.

It appears from the Epistle of St. Clement, that in consequence of a strife in the Church at Corinth respecting some of the Presbyters and Deacons of that Church, a part of the Church advocating their removal, a letter was sent to St. Clement requesting his opinion respecting the ejection of these ministers from their office. His Epistle was written in compliance with that request.

The translation of the forty-fourth chapter of the Epistle of Clement here presented is from the recent work entitled *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*.

"Our Apostles also knew through our Lord Jesus Christ, that there would be strife on account of the office of the Episcopate. For this reason, therefore, inasmuch as they have obtained a perfect fore-knowledge of this they appointed those [ministers] already mentioned, and afterwards gave instructions, that when these should fall asleep, other approved men should succeed them in their ministry. We are of opinion therefore, that those appointed by them or afterward by other eminent men with the consent of the whole Church, and who have blamelessly served the flock of Christ in a humble, peaceable and disinterested spirit, and have for a long time possessed the good opinion of all, cannot be justly dismissed from the Ministry. For our sin will not be small if we eject from the Episcopate those who have blamelessly and holily fulfilled its duties."

"Also." This word very correctly represents *καί* which in this place indicates a logical connection of what follows with what immediately precedes, a part of which is here transcribed.

"For when rivalry arose concerning the Priesthood and the tribes were contending among themselves as to which of them should be adorned with that glorious title, he commanded the twelve princes of the tribes to bring him their rods, each one being inscribed with the name of the tribe, and he took them and bound them [together] and sealed them with the rings of the princes of the tribes and laid them up in the tabernacle of witness on the table of God, * * * * * and the rod of Aaron was found not only to have blossomed but to bear fruit upon it. What think ye, believer? Did not Moses know beforehand that this would happen? Undoubtedly he knew, but he acted thus that there might be no sedition in Israel and that

the name of the true and only God might be glorified to whom be glory forever and ever. Amen." (Ep. of Clem. chapter 43.)

"Our Apostles also knew," through our Lord Jesus Christ, "that there would be strife on account of the office of the Episcopate." The parallel between the Apostles and Moses should be noted. Moses was instructed by God how to institute the Priesthood. The Apostles were instructed by Jesus Christ to institute the Christian Ministry. Moses was forewarned that it would be necessary to guard against rivalry and strife. The Apostles also were forewarned to guard against the same evil in the Church. And as Moses provided against contention about the Priesthood according to the will of God, so St. Clement says the Apostles acting under the directions of the Lord Jesus Christ gave to the Church a constitution by which the succession of His Ministers should be preserved. St. Clement, therefore, affirms that as Moses constituted the Priesthood under the law by a direct revelation from God, so the Apostles by a like revelation from the Lord Jesus constituted and ordered the sacred Ministry of the new dispensation, and that this Divine and authoritative constitution was given so that the order of the Ministry should be wise, permanent, and unchangeable, in no way subject to the whims of the multitude or the designs of ambitious men.

"Strife." (*ἔρις*). Our author in the use of this word doubtless had in mind the sedition and contention which arose about the Levitical priesthood stirred up in the rebellion of Korah, alluded to in the passage quoted above, about which a few things should be noticed.

Korah and his coleaders in the conspiracy, actuated by a personal ambition sought to supplant Aaron and the whole economy of the priesthood, that they might exalt themselves to this dignity. To this end they denied the divine authority by which Moses had given the law constituting the priestly office, and employed the customary arts of ambitious men to enlist the masses in their favor, by flattery, setting forth their dignity and importance. Korah and his company said, "Ye take too much upon you, seeing all the congregation are holy every one of them, and the Lord is among them, wherefore lift ye up yourselves above the congregation of the Lord?" (Num. xvi. 3.)

It is hardly needful to say that these conspirators employed the

usual arts of demagogues and ambitious men and aspirants for place and power. It would seem that the Corinthian Church was, when St. Clement wrote his Epistle, disturbed in a similar manner. From the Epistles of St. Paul it is evident that the spirit of disorder and insubordination began to be developed early in the history of that Church, which rebuked by him sharply was not wholly subdued. They seem to have had the notion that because all Christians were "called to be saints," all had an equal call to teach and to direct the affairs of the Church, subverting the established order of the Ministry, claiming to themselves the right to teach, and to set up whom they pleased to be Ministers, or of deposing those appointed to the sacred office at their pleasure.

Thus far the parallel is complete. The attempt in both cases to subvert the established order, and from similar motives, and by the use of like appeals to the people as holy, gives us examples illustrating the significance of that "strife" against which, according to St. Clement, the Lord Jesus Christ forewarned His disciples to guard by giving to the Church, a wise and unchangeable order and constitution of the sacred Ministry. Without such an admonition they might have supposed that by the holy calling by which all Christians are called, believers would be so completely freed from the old man, and so imbued with the meekness and gentleness of Christ, that there would be no need of an established government in the Church, and no fixed and unchangeable order in the Ministry. But the Master taught them otherwise, and directed them to provide against the wickedness and insubordination of depraved men whose working would show itself in the professed disciples of Christ Jesus.

"*Office of the Episcopate.*" Our translators have failed to give a true rendering of the words *ἐνὸνματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς*, by "office of the Episcopate." The rendering in the foot note, "title," can hardly be regarded an improvement. *Ὀνὸνματος* cannot be better translated than by the corresponding English word "name" as in the common version of the Holy Scriptures when similarly connected with other words. The phrases "my name;"—"his name;"—"The name of the Lord Jesus;"—"The name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," are to be understood as emphatic designations of the persons to whom they relate.

Accordingly St. Clement affirms that the Lord Jesus had foretold to the Apostles that there would be strife concerning the Episcopate with special reference to the substance, or as the Greeks would say, *δύναμις*, of the same, and as he is treating of the constituting of the several officers, and the designation of persons by whom the power of constituting was to be exercised, we must give to *ἐπισκοπῆς* as here used a significance which would correspond. And as our author proceeds to say that the Apostles to prevent strife assumed to themselves in the first instance the appointing or ordaining power, we cannot doubt that the Episcopate contemplated a superior rule or oversight as the word signifies when rendered literally. It is claimed for this interpretation that it accords with usage and harmonizes with the design and argument of the author.

"For this reason;" to wit, unless prevented by a wise constitution there would be strife about authority and rule in the Church. It should be noted that the action of the Apostles was taken from considerations pertaining to known characteristics of man, the nature and dignity of the sacred office, and their relation to those who should believe the Gospel. It is perfectly evident that St. Clement received from the Apostles that a ministry is essential to the preaching of the Gospel, the administration of the Sacraments, and the order and harmony of the Church, and that it was committed to them to determine how it should be constituted and perpetuated. The question to be considered is not whether the constitution of the Apostles was wise or, whether, if it had been invariably followed, perfect concord would have ever obtained, or whether all contention about the ministry has proceeded from a departure from the Apostolic arrangement. Nor yet whether the Apostles did give to the Church the constitution ascribed to them by St. Clement. It is important to a correct understanding of the writer to keep in mind the different circumstances of the present interpreter or expounder of his words, and of those to whom his Epistle was directed. With the facts narrated by him they were perfectly familiar. The order of the ministers then existing they well knew, and they could not be ignorant that it was the same which was instituted by the Apostles, for many of the ministry had been ordained by them. St. Clement therefore did not recount what the Apostles had done to give them information on that subject,

but to teach them that they acted under the command of the Lord Jesus, and that the order then existing was not merely provisional or temporary, suited only to the exigencies of the times, but permanent and unchangeable. All his words and phrases respecting what had been done were familiar to them, and easily understood. But our circumstances are different. We need to examine his words to ascertain the character of that constitution which he affirms the Apostles gave to the Church respecting the Order of the sacred ministry. The obscurity arises from the fact, that we are not able to know as contemporaries and eye-witnesses what the Apostles did, and from the general and brief manner of the writer in his reference to what was well known at the time, and from the use of these not uncommon words. His language was not obscure to those to whom he wrote, but to us on account of the reasons stated. Our attention therefore should be directed to the entire subject, and our inquiry should be, what does our author say the Apostles themselves did, and what rule did they give to be observed by the Church after them and by what authority?

We have already noticed the motives of the actions ascribed to them, and here let it not be forgotten that they did nothing without the command and guidance of the Lord Jesus Christ. For our author says, "Therefore inasmuch as they [the Apostles] have obtained a perfect foreknowledge of this," &c. He did not say knowledge, leaving it uncertain whether they obtained it from their own reasoning, or whether they were taught it by another, but "fore-knowledge," which could have been obtained only by a divine revelation. He had already said, "Our Apostles knew through our Lord Jesus Christ," &c. The word "perfect" is significant. It does not designate merely the completeness of their fore-knowledge, but indicates minuteness in respect to the divine Teacher, so that the constitution of the ministry should be adapted to the various exigencies of the Christian Church.

We come now to a consideration of the Apostolic constitution of the ministry according to St. Clement.

"*They appointed those [MINISTERS] already mentioned.*" It seems necessary to give at considerable length what our author had said respecting the appointments here referred to, for the subsequent action of the Apostles respecting the succession conformed to the same reasons or aim by which they had been guided in the

beginning of their work. It related to a perfecting of what had already been done, by providing for its perpetuity, as we shall have occasion to notice.

"These things therefore being manifest to us, and since we look into the depths of divine knowledge, it behooves us to do all things in [their proper] order, which the Lord has commanded us to perform at stated times. He has enjoined offerings [to be presented,] and services to be performed [to Him,] and that not thoughtlessly or irregularly, but at the appointed times and hours. When and by whom He desires these things to be done, He Himself has fixed by His own supreme will, in order that all things being piously done according to His good pleasure, may be acceptable to Him. Those, therefore, who present their offerings at the appointed times are accepted and blessed; for inasmuch as they follow the laws of the Lord, they sin not. For His own peculiar services are assigned to the High Priest, and their own proper plan is prescribed to the Priests, and their own special ministrations devolve on the Levites. The layman is bound by the laws that pertain to laymen." [1 Epis. Clem. chap. 40.]

"The Apostles have preached the gospel to us from the Lord Jesus Christ, Jesus Christ [has done so] from God. Christ, therefore, was sent forth by God, and the Apostles by Christ. Both these appointments then were made in an orderly way, according to the will of God. Having, therefore, received their orders and being fully assured by the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ, and established in the laws of God with full assurance of the Holy Ghost, they went forth proclaiming that the Kingdom of God was at hand, and thus preaching through countries and cities they appointed the first-fruits [of their labors,] having first proved them by the Spirit, to be the Bishops and Deacons of those who should afterwards believe, nor was this any new thing, since indeed many ages before it was written concerning Bishops and Deacons. For thus saith the Scriptures in a certain place. "I will appoint their Bishops in righteousness and their Deacons in the faith." [1 Epis. Clem. chap. 42.]

"And what wonder is it if those in Christ who were intrusted with such a duty by God appointed those [ministers] before mentioned when the blessed Moses, also a faithful servant, "in all his house," noted down in the sacred books all the injunctions which were given him, and when the other Prophets also followed with one consent to the ordinances which He had appointed?" [1 Epis. Clem. chap. 43.]

The remainder of this chapter has been previously transcribed, beginning with "For when virtually," &c., which should be recurred to and read in its connection with what precedes.

We should in this place recall to mind the reason why these things were written by St. Clement, viz., to prove to the Corinthians that Bishops and Deacons having been appointed by a divine arrangement, they who had faithfully fulfilled the duties of their ministry could not be removed from their offices. This he

argues from the fact that they had been ordained according to a necessary law of order, instituted and enjoined by God Himself. He compares this order in the Christian ministry to the order of the Priesthood. In another place not transcribed, he illustrates it by the order of the constitution of an army, and also following what had been written by St. Paul, he likens it to the order of the human body in these words:

"There is a kind of mixture in all things, and thence arises mutual advantage. Let us take our body for an example. The head is nothing without the feet, and the feet are nothing without the head, yet the very smallest members of our body are useful to the whole body. But all work harmoniously together, and are under one common rule for the formation of the whole body." [1 Epis. Clem. chap. 37.]

Having thus taught that order is necessary in the nature of things, he proceeds to show that the order of the ministry is established and arranged by God Himself, and in such a manner that every minister acts under this authority, having been appointed either directly by Him, or by those to whom He has given power to appoint or ordain others. He sent forth the Lord Jesus Christ. The Lord Jesus appointed Apostles, and the Apostles acting under the guidance and commandment of the Lord appointed Bishops and Deacons.

The mission of Christ was approved of God by the Resurrection, and the Holy Ghost; the Apostles received these powers by which their appointment by the Lord was clearly manifested, and they appointed as Bishops and Deacons those who had been proved and found to be true disciples, competent for the discharge of the duties of the office to which they were called, and who were full of the Holy Ghost. One thing to be noted here of no small consequence as proving the divine appointment of the ministry, is the fact that it is in the order of time anterior to the laity. Christ was before, and called the Apostles. The Apostles were before, and appointed the Bishops and Deacons; authority to constitute and to perform the duties of the several offices proceeds in the same way. Bishops and Deacons are by Apostles; Apostles are by the Lord Jesus, and the Lord Jesus by God the Father, the source of all power, glory and blessedness. These things being so, the latter and subordinate can no more remove the former and superior, than they can constitute them. This constitution of the ministry was ordered by God, so that strife might find no place, and

the fact of a Divine constitution should be sufficient to quell all sedition and disorder which ambitious men might seek to introduce into the Churches. And to quell the disorder in the Corinthian Church, St. Clement urged these considerations. In his reference to the appointment of Bishops and Deacons, he did not design to teach the Corinthians that such ministers had been appointed by the Apostles, for that they knew, but to teach them that these appointments were by Divine authority, and according to a necessary order, constituted and arranged by God Himself and therefore, not to be interfered with.

But according to St. Clement, the constitution was not yet complete for the order and succession of the ministry. Could the Apostles have lived to the end of the world, and had their number been sufficient to so great a work as that to which they were or would have been called, they doubtless had retained among themselves the power and work of appointing or ordaining other ministers. But they were subject to death. The question here arose how a ministry of mortal men should be perpetuated and how the first divinely constituted order should be maintained. This point was not neglected by St. Clement. He says:

"They appointed those already mentioned and afterwards gave instructions ἐπινομήν that when these should fall asleep, other approved men should succeed them in the ministry." A discussion of the word ἐπινομήν which our translators have rendered, instructions, will be reserved to another place. As occasion shall require it will be rendered *constitution* as more agreeable to usage and the context.

"And afterwards gave a constitution." It appears from this statement that this constitution was not given to the Church until some time after the ascension of Christ, and the gospel had been preached, and churches had been gathered in various countries, districts and cities. Doubtless it was given a sufficient time before the death of the Apostles, so that the entire church constitution could be permanently established under their supervision and receive their apostolic authority.

"That, when these should fall asleep." That is, Bishops and Deacons first appointed by Apostles. The word δπως should have been rendered "so that," for the object in giving the constitution was not simply to give instructions or directions that succes-

sors to Bishops and Deacons should be appointed, by a permanent rule or organic law, to secure to the Church a succession of ministers, such as would be approved of God. If we render, $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$, "that," so far as this word is concerned, all provisions respecting the judging of qualifications of those who should be appointed, and by whom appointed, are ignored, and since these things were certainly contemplated by the author, being specifically named by him, to translate $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$, "that," would make him write very poor Greek. " $\Theta\pi\omega\varsigma$ as an adverb, denotes "how" or "how that;" as a final conjunction, "so that." In both cases it contemplates means by which the end announced in the apodosis is to be secured. When the means are distinctly and definitely given in the protasis $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$ may be elegantly rendered "that." When they are not thus announced, but general principles are laid down, requiring deliberation, or rules, or laws given to secure the desired end, $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$ should be translated "so that." Whatever $\epsilon\pi\iota\nu\omicron\mu\eta\iota\nu$ signifies, it is evident that it contemplates an end by means requiring deliberation in an agent or agents acting according to given rules. This is manifest from what follows. The agents are not in this instance specified in the apodosis. To the Corinthians this was not necessary since they knew who they were. We must determine to whom or to what order of men the work contemplated was committed from the nature of the same, or from the context. Happily that point is cleared by these means.

"*Other approved men.*" It is evident that the successors were to be proved by the same standards, and to possess the same qualifications required in their predecessor. Our author says thus the Apostles "proved by the Spirit." The Word of God says that the Apostles required that those whom they first ordained to the Diaconate should be men "of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom." And with that agree the instructions of St. Paul to Timothy, and Titus respecting Bishops or Presbyters and Deacons, and by a comparison of what St. Clement affirmed in this plan with the epistles to these holy men, it seems to be quite probable that their appointment and the instructions given to them constituted a very important part of the constitution ($\epsilon\pi\iota\nu\omicron\mu\eta\iota\nu$), given by the Apostles to the Church.

"*Should succeed them in their ministry.*" This phrase needs no comment excepting the word translated ministry should perhaps

be considered. But a discussion of the proper rendering of that word is reserved to another place. It is important to remark here, that we have in this clause an element of the constitution, to wit, that the same ministry instituted at the beginning by the Apostles was to be continued in the Church by an uninterrupted succession of men duly approved and ordained to the sacred offices of the same.

"We are of opinion therefore." The word *therefore*, οὖν, denotes that the writer has arrived to that point in his discourse when he presents the conclusion which the arguments previously presented have enforced upon him, or which he would enforce upon others. It is worthy of note that he has not as yet said anything respecting those who were to appoint the successors of the first Bishops and Deacons. The Corinthians needed no instruction on that topic. But it is very much to our profit that in the very next sentence that subject is so effectually cleared that there can be no uncertainty or doubt respecting it.

"That those appointed by them or afterwards by other eminent men." "Appointed." This word as here used uniformly means appointed by authority, ordained, or constituted, and was very uniformly used when the writer designed to express that one, by power or authority vested in himself, appointed another or others to any office of trust or responsibility. A few examples will be given to illustrate the usage of sacred writers.

"And I took from among you men of wisdom, and knowledge, and understanding, and appointed (*κατέστησα*) to rule over you, rulers of thousands," &c., Deut. i. 15, (Sept. Tr.). "Behold, I appoint (*καθίστημι*) thee this day over all the land of Egypt. Gen. xlv. 41, (Sept. Tr.).

"Whom we may appoint (*καταστήσομεν*) over this business." Acts vi. 3.

"For this cause left I thee in Crete that thou mightest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain (*κατάστησα*) elders in every city." Tit. i. 5.

"For every high priest is ordained (*κατίσταναι*) to offer gifts and sacrifices." Heb. viii. 2.

These examples are sufficient to exhibit usage, from which we learn that to appoint or ordain Presbyters and Deacons was something more than a ceremonial or ritualistic introduction to an

occupation or office. They teach that those who ordained to these sacred offices by authority committed to them by God, did communicate authority to administer Sacraments, to preach the Gospel, to rule in the Church, and to exercise all other functions of the offices of Presbyters and Deacons.

"Other eminent men," (*ἐτέρων ἐλλογίμων*). The Apostles were "eminent men" who appointed the first Bishops and Deacons, and "other eminent men" appointed in like manner others.

Our author places both in the same class, characterizes both by the same word, and ascribes to both the same work and the same authority, affirms afterwards that to act in derogation of the work of either, performed in pursuance of this authority, would be equally a sin against God. "Who were these "other eminent men?" Were they the united brotherhood? Certainly not, for they are distinguished from the same in the next clause, "with the consent of the whole Church." Were they the united council of Presbyters? Certainly not, for then they would not have been classed with men who were superior to those, who had simply Presbyterial authority. Who, then, were they? They were men appointed under the constitution given by the Apostles to the Church, so that when they themselves should fall asleep, there should be in the Church a succession of men of their own order, or in other words, who should receive their authority and perform their work in ordaining ministers of the gospel. No other interpretation can possibly be given to the words of St. Clement. Let us here recall the argument of our author by which he would teach the Corinthians that their Presbyters and Deacons should not be removed from their offices. He affirms that the order and the several offices of the ministry were instituted by God, and that the validity of the several orders depended upon a mutual relation between the superior and subordinate. God sends Christ, Christ sends the Apostles, and the Apostles commission Bishops and Deacons. This order is proved, inasmuch as the superior appoints the inferior. But, since the Apostles would fall asleep, the established divine order would be destroyed unless there should be a continuation of their office.

This contingency was provided for by the constitution (*ἐπινομήν*) given for this express purpose, and when this was given those who succeeded to their place and work in respect to ordaining or con-

stituting ministers were along with them called "eminent," (or we should more accurately say) "chief men." Therefore, says our author, it was equally a sin against God to remove from office those appointed by the successors of the Apostles as it would be to remove those appointed by the Apostles themselves. There is no possible distinction made between Presbyters ordained by Apostles, and Presbyters ordained by other chief men who succeeded to the work of Apostles. Hence it appears that our author did affirm a succession in the Apostolic office, and that this was essential to a succession of Bishops, or Presbyters, and Deacons. A corollary from this is no Apostles, no ministry. The divine order was God, Jesus Christ, Apostles. There the ordaining or appointing power stops. It proceeds no further. If the "other chief men" did not have Apostolic authority, St. Clement's argument could not possibly apply to such Presbyters as had been ordained by them. In all he had said he had not ascribed authority to constitute to any persons below, in order, Apostles. "Eminent men" (*ἐλλογιμῶν*.) This is not a common word, but when used always denotes that which is chief or of the first order. This would be a decisive philological argument sustaining the interpretation already given, unless by "chief men," we understand persons raised above their brethren by reason of superior excellence ascribed to them, as some Presbyters might be more popular than others. This could not have been, for then the very evil which St. Clement affirms the Apostles were warned to guard against, was authorized as a ruling element in the Church. They were "chief men" by order, and not by personal characteristics. No other interpretation can be possibly admitted or justified.

"*With the consent of the whole Church.*" It should be noted that the approval of the whole Church was given to those men ordained by Apostles. But this approval or commendation in no manner constituted them Presbyters or Deacons, nor conferred any authority to assume the functions of the sacred ministry. The custom of appointing to office with the consent of the congregation was as old as the days of Moses. See Deut. i. 13. The Apostles consulted the brethren in respect to the selection of persons who should receive the office of the Diaconate. But in all cases the consenting or approving is to be distinguished from the constituting or ordaining.

The remaining part of the chapter sets forth the wickedness toward God, and injury of brethren in ejecting good and faithful men ordained by Divine authority from their office. Our author says:

"We are of opinion, therefore, that those appointed by them or afterwards by other chief men, with the consent of the whole Church, and who have blamelessly served the flock of Christ in a humble and disinterested spirit, and have for a long time possessed the good opinion of all, cannot be justly dismissed from the ministry. For our sin will not be small if we eject from the Episcopate those who have blamelessly and holily fulfilled its duties."

Comments on this passage to a great extent have been anticipated. Let it be noted here that, "therefore" refers directly to what the author had affirmed respecting the Divine authority for the constitution of the Sacred offices in the Church, from which he argues that those appointed to these offices could not be ejected from the same, since such an act would be a flagrant sin against God, an act directly antagonistical to the will of Christ given through Apostles respecting the constitution of the Christian Church, and would give license to disorder and strife which he taught them to guard against.

It is deemed necessary to examine the import of certain words which in the previous discussion have not been adequately considered.

"*Ministry*" (*λειτουργίαν*.) This word Liddell and Scott define "a public service, especially at Athens,—a burdensome public duty or office which the richer citizens discharged at their own expense, usually in rotation, also voluntarily or by appointment." * * * * "Any service, work of a public kind,—in LXX. the worship, public service of God; hence ecclesiastically public worship in general, but more particularly the Eucharist." The English word ministry does not adequately express all that is signified by the two Greek words *διακονία* and *λειτουργία*, the former of which denotes the ministry or preaching of the Word of the Gospel from God to men; the latter the offering of prayers or other acts of worship from men to God, which worship under the law was joined with sacrifices, but under the Gospel is always through the sacrifice and atonement of Christ. Our English word ministry signifies only service in general, not in any manner indicating the nature or character of that service.

Λειτουργία used as a name of Sacred offices, or services in the Church, was unquestionably borrowed from the usage of the Old Testament where it designated an office or service connected with sacrificial worship. It is seldom found in the New Testament, apparently for the reason that the Sacred writers spoke principally of the ministry of the word, or the work of preaching the gospel. But as under the law teachers were also Priests who in some way served the tabernacle, that is ministered in the offering of sacrifices and prayers, so under the Gospel those who were appointed to preach the Gospel, led the congregation in prayers, and administered the Holy Sacrament. I find the word *λειτουργία* or its cognates used in the New Testament in the following passages. "That I should be the minister (*λειτουργον*) of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministering (*ἰερουργῶντα*) the Gospel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost." Rom. xv. 15.

It should be noted that the Apostle in this text does not call himself *διδάκωνος* but *λειτουργός*. Since his object was not so much to assert his office as a preacher of the Gospel as through his ministry to prepare from among the Gentiles men to be an offering *προσφορά* acceptable *εὐπροσδεκτος*. His classic accuracy is worthy of notice.

"Yea, and if I be offered upon the sacrifice and service (*λειτουργία*) of your faith." Phil. ii. 17. The offertory character of *λειτουργία* is too obvious in this passage to need comment. "For the administration of this service" ("ὅτι διακονία τῆς λειτουργίας ταύτης.") 2 Cor. ix. 12. Here *διακονία* and *λειτουργία* are put together in the same sentence, the first denoting a service of men to men, the other the sacred offering which was made to God for the poor, as will be seen by comparing 1 Cor. xvi. 2. The early Churches presented offerings at the Holy Communion every Lord's day; a portion of the gifts offered was used for the Sacrament, and the rest or mass went to the support of the poor and other beneficial purposes.

Lexicographers derive (*λειτουργία*) from *λείτος* and *εργον* and give as the radical definition a public work. Usage in the Septuagint and in the New Testament would seem to indicate a derivation from *λήτη*, and *εργον*, with a radical meaning, work of prayer or service pertaining to prayer, (*τα κατὰ λήτην*.) Now if it be

considered that among the Greeks as well as Romans, the Priestly office was the first in dignity, and that the highest civil officer presided over the public, religious, sacrificial worship, nothing forbids that they should have denominated the service of the chief officers of the commonwealth *λειτουργον*, with a derivation as above suggested. But as it would be useless to dispute authorities, let it be sufficient that according to Holy Scripture *λειτουργία* designates service pertaining to sacrifice, to prayer, or to every thing belonging to the worship of God.

But while St. Clement in the passage under discussion designates the office work of Presbyters and Deacons by a word which indicates its sacredness and relation to a living union and fellowship of the Saints with God, the works of the diaconate, and of government are not excluded, for they are always regarded as appertaining to the office of the ministers of God and of Christ.

Ἐπινομήν. This word I have rendered "constitution." All cognate words, both nouns and verbs derived from its root *νεμω* have two classes of definitions, viz. I. To divide, distribute or assign, and in the middle voice to have or hold, to possess or enjoy, usually by usage or presentation, to own as a custom or usage, to believe, to think. Division, law, custom, usage. II. To pasture, to graze, in the translation, hence, *i. e.*, to drain, to pasture, to feed, and in the middle to feed, to graze.

The preposition *ἐπὶ* would give the additional idea of over or added to, as an appendix. The latter definition seems to be preferable, since the word of which it is a part follows *μεταξού* afterwards, according to Greek usage to express by a pleonasm, the same idea by two words having something common in their significance. Hence *ἐπινομή* is an addition to a law. The word *ἐπινομή* is so rare that it is necessary to derive its meaning as used by St. Clement from general usage of cognate words and from the context. By the first method we find that it would designate, a common law, having authority by usage, that is, organic law or constitution. Hence our author affirms that the Apostles gave to the Church a continuation of what had been exercised by them by authority from the Lord Jesus, *i. e.*, to go to pasture, in an abode allotted, or an assigned pasture or district; to shepherd. There is a metaphorical usage, to spread over or devour as a fire.

These two classes of definitions seem very unlike, and yet the

fact that in ancient times pasture lands being mountainous or otherwise unsuitable for cultivation were occupied in common, by herdsmen and shepherds, would be sufficient authority for supposing that lands used or assigned by prescription and occupied in common by all would be designated by the names given to the law, or title by which they were so held and occupied. The derivation of the English words, common, common-land, common-law, commons and house of commons, indicating a general right or law derived from usage, and whatever is held by such title, is very similar.

It remains to examine the context with special reference to the meaning to be assigned to ἐπινομήν. The Apostles being forewarned by the Lord Jesus, to prevent strife about the Episcopate, appointed Bishops and Deacons, and to guard against the same evil when they should have fallen asleep, they gave to the Church a constitution, so that there should be a succession in the sacred offices, such as had been instituted at the first, and in pursuance of this provision, there were "chief men," other than themselves, to whom was given power to constitute ministers. Furthermore it appears that what was given was for the future welfare of the Church through the continuance of the same sacred offices and the customs given by the Lord Jesus. Hence it appears that our English word *constitution* is a true rendering of the ἐπινομήν if we use the word rather in the English than in the American sense.

To determine the meaning of an obscure word in the protasis denoting the means to an end expressed in the apodosis we need only to ascertain what that end is. In this instance we know that the end sought comprises these things.

1. A succession of Bishops or Presbyters and Deacons in the Church.

2. Approved men to be appointed to these offices.

3. The accomplishment of these results makes necessary some standard by which a decision may be made respecting the qualifications of men, and

4. There must also be men competent to judge of qualifications and appoint or ordain, and these must be designated.

To secure all these results, there must of necessity be rules laid down, which taken together make what we call a constitution. If, therefore, we translate ἐπινομήν instructions we arrive at the same conclusion; for instructions embracing so many particulars would

be only another name of the same thing, a constitution. But the word would be objectionable as liable to misconstruction.*

In respect to the ordaining or constituting ministers, the language is not unlike that used by St. Paul in Eph. iv. 11. "And he gave some Apostles and some Prophets, and some Evangelists and some Pastors and Teachers." This was the first constitution of the ministry not found in a regular treatise or written constitution, but imparted in a living form in the ordination of, or constituting fit persons in various orders of the ministry. And for the succession of the offices of the ministry according to this divine order our author says the Apostles gave an appended law or constitution, as a rule for a continuation of the already established constitution, and if we follow the authority of usage of words we are to understand that this constitution was given in successive acts by the Apostles with reference to the end to be received, and perhaps in the written instructions to Timothy and Titus.

It remains to compare the statement of St. Clement with what is taught in sacred Scripture, and if the interpretation here given corresponds with the letter it may be supposed to be correct.

We learn from the Epistles to Timothy and Titus that these holy men had committed to them the power to ordain with all concomitant power, even to that of rejecting candidates whom they should find unfit for the sacred office. It appears also that they had committed to them jurisdiction over Presbyters and Deacons, and that in the exercise of these powers they acted independently of all superior human control. Moreover the instructions given to them were designed to confirm their authority, and as a law to guide them and all others in the exercise of the same important functions. Hence it appears that there were in all respects "chief men" other than the Apostles who did the very work described by St. Clement. It may be added here that they were not called in the Scriptures by any other title than Apostles. It is true that one of them was exhorted to do the work of an Evangelist. But all Ministers, Apostles, Bishops or Presbyters and Deacons did the same work. We are ever to distinguish between the usage of a word when employed as a title of office or order, and when designating a function. The same function may belong to various orders, but a title designates that which belongs peculiarly to a particular office. We find in Smith's Dictionary of the Bible

under the article Apostles, the following: "When it is claimed for Bishops of any Church officer that they are their [apostles] successors, it can be understood these functions did not include all which belong to the apostolic office. The higher order in the sacred ministry possess all the functions of the lower, having somewhat which belongs exclusively to itself. There is something of rank among the Apostles. But the question here to be considered was the power to ordain, an exclusive function of the apostolic office, however that office in later times out of respect to the first or chief Apostles may have been designated by another title. From Holy Scripture we learn that Apostles did ordain or communicated the gifts of the sacred office, and that none others than those called Apostles did exercise this power. For aught that we know to the contrary this was an apostolic function, and if all the functions of Apostles ceased when they fell asleep, then there are now no ordained ministers only chronologically and not officially." This is very loosely said, and is the conclusion from this statement. "As regards the *apostolic* office it seems to have been pre-eminently that of founding Churches and upholding them by supernatural powers specially bestowed for that purpose. It ceased, as a matter of course, with its first holders,—all continuance of its existence (comp. 1 Cor. ix. 1) being impossible." And yet the same author admits that St. Paul was an Apostle, and that he was not one of the "first holders," and the Scripture referred to St. Paul applies specifically to himself. It may be added that Barnabas was an Apostle as well as Paul, and Timothy, and Silvanus, Epaphroditus and others are called in Holy Scripture Apostles. Doubtless there were functions of the office as held by the twelve Apostles, which belonged exclusively to them. But if any persons assume these functions, we are not bound to respect this assumption, and it would seem to be absurd to suppose that the Apostles acting under the direction of the Lord Jesus ordained ministers who were to discharge the duties of their offices during their lifetime, leaving the Church in all future time without any lawfully appointed ministers, to be distracted by contentions and strife, such as St. Clement says the Apostles were careful to guard the Churches against, being admonished by the Lord Jesus. Finding therefore a perfect agreement between the Epistle of St.

Clement, as here interpreted, and Holy Scripture, the interpretation is corroborated, as it would seem sufficiently.

Having commented on the words and phrases employed by St. Clement in the 44th Chapter of his Epistle to the Corinthians, it will be profitable to bring together the arguments he employs to convince the brethren that they could not eject their Presbyters and Deacons from their office.

1. As Moses, being instructed by God to prevent strife about the Priesthood, referred the decision to the determination of God Himself, instead of the general suffrage of the people, so the Apostles assumed the exclusive power of constituting ministers, being admonished so to do by the Lord Jesus, that contention and strife might be prevented.

2. To provide for a succession of ministers, they gave a constitution embracing the same method of procedure which they instituted at the first. This constitution secured to the Church an order of "chief men" like themselves in whom was vested the exclusive power to ordain. St. Clement does not include all these other chief men, Apostles, but ascribes to them functions which the Apostles had reserved to themselves as the peculiar prerogatives of their office.

3. He assigns to these other chief men the same powers as were committed to Timothy and Titus in respect to ordination, who are called Apostles in Holy Scripture.

4. The Bishops and Deacons of St. Clement as distinct from the Apostles, and other chief men, are inferior to them and were appointed by them.

5. A succession of Bishops or Presbyters and Deacons is made to depend upon a succession of chief men, invested with apostolic powers.

6. The succession of these orders was constitutionally provided for, so that strife about the ministry might be effectually prevented.

7. St. Clement claimed for this constitution and its provision divine authority.

8. According to St. Clement the Christian Ministry itself, its several orders, the method of its constitution and succession, are ordained of God and given to the Churches by the Apostles of our Lord. Indeed his whole argument against the ejection of Presby-

ters and Deacons at Corinth, from their offices, is based upon the fact that their ordination was from God, and therefore they could not be deposed so long as they were faithful to the trust committed to them.

In the comment here given no reference has been made to contemporaneous or subsequent writers. It is well known that such a constitution as St. Clement describes did exist in Apostolic Churches, and so far as we have information on the subject, we know of no other in any Church planted by the Apostles. The writings of Ignatius confirm and more than confirm what was written by St. Clement. Later writers as Irenæus, Tertullian and Cyprian, and indeed as many as have written on the subject, have borne testimony to the Apostolic succession, and to the three orders in the ministry. If anything contrary to this existed no one knows anything about it. If a different constitution was given to the Churches by the Apostles, how strange that what they gave should have been subverted even in the lifetime of many who were their contemporaries, and so quietly that no resistance was made to it, or even a word said about it!

ART. VI.—A PLEA FOR PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

MAN comes into the world, himself infected with an evil nature which is constantly tempting him to sin, and everywhere surrounded by objects and influences which appeal to his innate sinful propensities tending powerfully to call them into action, and so develop them more and more. And if he were left unaided in his purposes to lead a virtuous life, and unrestrained in his temptations to sin, he would be utterly powerless before the combined forces of enemies, both within and without himself. So powerful are his foes that nothing short of Almighty aid will enable him to resist them. He must receive the Divine energy of Christ's Spirit in his soul, "and manfully fight under His banner against sin, the world and the Devil," or he can never overcome in the Christian's warfare. Every aid must be improved and every weapon vigorously handled in this life-long conflict.

And as it is with the individual Christian, so with the body of Christians collectively in their organic capacity—the Church. As it is made up of individuals every one of whom is more or less imperfect, sinful and corrupt, it must of course embody a great amount of evil and corruption. And like the individual Christian it too has powerful enemies to contend against within itself. It has also foes to meet from without, for it was established in the world to triumph over all forms of sin and irreligion, and to banish them so far as possible from the face of the earth. It moreover needs the Divine energy of Christ's Spirit, accompanied with the very best use of all the means of Salvation, to carry on successfully the great warfare in which it is engaged. *But those which were used by the Church in the first ages of Christianity, seem by far to have been the most effectual for the spread of the Gospel.* And it is for this reason especially that we plead for a return to primitive Christianity, even in the instrumentalities which it used for the promotion of the Gospel.

When the Son of God had fulfilled His mission here upon earth, and had ascended into Heaven, eleven obscure men composed the entire band of Christian soldiers, whom Christ had sent forth fully armed and equipped to rescue the world from the dominion of the powers of darkness. Others had also in some measure been trained for this holy warfare. But only one hundred and twenty seem to have been their constant adherents, until upon the day of Pentecost, when about three thousand souls were added.

Soon we read of Jewish Priests, who, though at first bitterly opposed, had already espoused the cause of Christ. But as yet the Gospel had been made known only in Jerusalem, one solitary city of a remote province of the vast Roman Empire. Who then could at that time have conceived on any principle of worldly calculation what glorious triumphs were in store for it? Who could have thought that this new form of Religion was destined to revolutionize the existing forms of philosophy, and eventually overspread the whole earth? No wonder then, that the enemies of the new faith should consider the first efforts for establishing the Church by a few obscure and unlearned men, as an arraying of ignorance against learning, folly against wisdom, and weakness against strength. But they went forth in the name and strength of the Almighty, and it proved most eminently true, according to the language of the Apostle

that "the foolishness of God is wiser than men and the weakness of God is stronger than men," 1 Cor. i. 25. And so much so, that in the space of about two hundred years the Cross had been planted throughout Judea, Samaria, Phœnicia, Cyprus, and Syria, so that those renowned cities, Tyre and Sidon, and Antioch, became trophies of the glorious conquest; next in Macedonia, Greece and throughout nearly the whole of Asia Minor, including the Church in Ephesus, over which the youthful Bishop St. Timothy presided; about this time also in the capital of the Roman Empire, and in various other parts of Italy, and, (among the last of his very abundant labors), by the Apostle St. Paul, in the island of Crete, in Spain, and as we have every reason to believe, even in England itself; probably also by other Apostles in parts of Chaldea, Mesopotamia and Egypt, if not in Persia, Arabia and Ethiopia.*

Justin Martyr, who wrote about A. D. 150, says, "There is no race of men whether barbarian or Greek, or by whatever other name they be designated, whether they wander in wagons, or dwell in tents, amongst whom prayers and thanksgivings are not offered to the Father and Creator of all, in the name of the crucified Jesus."

A living writer† has given us a very comprehensive view of the triumphs of early Christianity as follows: "In passing on from the first to the fourth century, what is the spectacle which presents itself to our view? We see within the patriarchate of Antioch, including Mesopotamia, eighty-seven Bishoprics had been founded; in Palestine, forty-eight; in Arabia, twenty-one; in Asia Minor, where the Dioceses were mostly small, four hundred and three; in Africa, four hundred and sixty-six; in Greece, and the countries now known as Roumania and Bulgaria, one hundred and forty-five; in Italy, together with the southern part of Germany, three hundred; in France, Spain and the British Isles, two hundred and ten; amounting in all, to upwards of one thousand Episcopal Sees for the East, and somewhat less than seven hundred for the west of Christendom."

And not only had Christianity become thus widely disseminated, but its converts were very numerous wherever it had been established. According to the testimony of Pliny, even at that early period, it had nearly caused the heathen worship in Pontus and Bithinia to be deserted.

Says Tertullian, "We are but of yesterday, yet we have filled your empire, your cities, your islands, your castles, your corporate towns, your assemblies, your very camps, your tribes, your

* Palmer's Eccl. History, chap. II.

† The Rt. Rev'd. Bishop Wadsworth.

companies, your palace, your senate, your forum; your temples alone are left to you."

Such, in brief, are the wonderful triumphs of Christianity for the space of about three hundred years. The little band of only eleven had grown into an innumerable army, which was a mighty power in all the nations of the earth. In all the annals of Christendom, there is nothing to compare with this ratio of increase.

Such unexampled prosperity was doubtless due, in a high degree, to the soundness of their faith, the ardor of their zeal, the saintliness of their lives, as exhibited in their devotion to every good work, their patient endurance under injuries and persecutions, their love and devotion to each other's welfare, in short in their individual character and labor.

But, we are to remember that the Church on earth is the Church militant, and as it is not enough that an army is made up of strong and brave soldiers, but, as they must be firmly banded together and disciplined, and all made to act in concert under their officers of different grades, so likewise, important as it is to the individual Christian that he have on the whole armor of God, and be ready to fight manfully against sin, the world and the devil, it is nevertheless not enough to enable the Church to carry on a successful warfare against the powers of darkness. Like so many private soldiers these individual Christians must be perfectly banded together, all striving as one for the same end, all acting in perfect harmony to achieve the greatest results.

And such in fact was the case with the Primitive Church in a much higher degree than has ever been witnessed since. It was everywhere found with the same organic existence; everywhere using the same instrumentalities in its holy warfare.

Nor can we regard this state of things as merely accidental, nor yet, as purely the result of the human wisdom of the early Christians in adapting the instrumentalities of the Church so perfectly to the age and circumstances in which they lived, but rather as having had its origin, as to its characteristic features at least, in the very inspiration of the Apostles themselves.

What should we think of an army of soldiers where the different departments were at variance with each other; where sword was turned against sword, and all were at times at least more engaged to supplant each other than to subdue the common foe?

Now this is essentially the case with the Christian denominations in this country, call things by whatever names we will; delude ourselves by whatever sophistry we choose, it is nevertheless true that priest is arrayed against priest, and altar against altar, and thereby the energies of the Church greatly wasted and her moral power deplorably weakened.

What a contrast between Primitive Christianity and present Christianity! And should not the mournful fact that it is so distracted and consequently so weakened and disabled, that it has become absolutely incompetent to perform its legitimate and appropriate work, arouse us to plead in earnest for a return to that type which it presented in its better days?

And now the question arises, how shall this be done? By what principles are we to be guided in so important a change? We answer simply by these two:

1st. By not enjoining anything which the Primitive Church did not with *entire unanimity* enjoin.

2d. By freely tolerating everything which the Primitive Church tolerated and practiced.

Upon the first head we need not enlarge, for it is a well-known fact that in modern times, and even within our own remembrance many denominations of Christians have sprung into existence, and have set forth terms of membership and communion unheard of before, and instituted discipline unconceived of by the Primitive Church, while the Papal Church though organically an old denomination, has also done the same thing, and from time to time is still binding new dogmas upon the consciences of her subjects.

Notwithstanding all such ecclesiastical enactments are so many barriers in the way of a return to that type of Christianity which is the best the world has ever seen; with all our pretensions to progress and improvements on institutions of former ages, religious as well as secular, it is not at all wonderful that we should find new inventions in doctrines, in discipline and in practice, and that these should be enforced, by ecclesiastical enactments upon the consciences and lives of Christians. Indeed it would be wonderful if it were not so.

But when we turn to the consideration of our second proposition, and inquire whether the Christianity of the present day, and particularly that in our own country does freely tolerate everything

which the Primitive Church tolerated and practiced, we are met with the most astounding fact that *some of the most important features of the Primitive Christianity can find toleration no where throughout the length and breadth of our land!* Others again find it only in a limited degree.

So far as our civil and political institutions are concerned, it is justly the pride of every true child of this great Republic, that every man's religion has full toleration throughout our vast domain, and that hundreds of other forms and phases of religion would still be tolerated should they spring into existence. But on the contrary, it is the shame of the religious denominations of this country, that while so free and untrammelled themselves, they have never fully tolerated the Christianity of the pure Primitive and Catholic Church. Yes, strange and paradoxical as it may seem, the Christianity of this country has never fully and freely tolerated the best type of the Christian Religion that was ever known,—a heavy charge indeed but none the less true.

The great Scripture characteristic of the true Church is *steadfast continuance in the Apostles' doctrine, fellowship, breaking of bread and prayers.*

Now the Apostolic office itself,—the very head and front of this primitive system,—is excluded from nearly all of the religious bodies of this country. And how with reference to the doctrines and rites of the Church?

In the first ages ordination was given by Bishops, as successors in office to the Apostles themselves, but wheresoever the Apostolic office is cast out, Apostolic ordination is necessarily cast out with it.

Again as successors of the Apostles, Bishops laid their hands upon all the individual members of the Church to communicate more fully the gifts of the Spirit unto them. And hence, wheresoever the Apostolic office is cast out the rite of laying on of hands is cast out with it.

Infant Baptism was a doctrine of the Apostolic and Primitive Church, and by means of it infants were made members of the same; but a large share of American Christians reject the doctrine as an absurdity and corruption, and in their organic capacity will have no fellowship with the innocence of childhood. They exclude the tender lambs from their folds, and leave them in such

an anomalous state, that one hardly knows whether to call them Christian or Heathen children.

And further how can those denominations which exclude the Apostolic office, and by consequence the successors of the Apostles, be said to *continue steadfastly in the Apostles' fellowship*? Without Apostolic office or fellowship how can their breaking of bread—the celebration of the Holy Eucharist—be regarded as *a continuing in the Apostles' breaking of bread*? Apostles neither set forth or in any way authorize the prayers of their worshiping congregations. How then can they be regarded as *continuing in the Apostles' prayers*? Hence, as strange and deplorable as it is, with all our professions of liberality to the contrary notwithstanding, the great majority of American Christians do not countenance or tolerate the great Scripture characteristic of the Christian Church as embraced in these four particulars. And what is even more deplorable they *are organically unable to do it*.

If it is an error not to conform to the general principles of toleration already laid down (and no one we think will call in question the correctness of the latter) then all the denominations of the country fall alike under condemnation; some however in a higher degree than others, since some do not tolerate the ministry or even some of the most important doctrines of the early Church, while others, as ourselves, continue steadfast in both.

With a primitive ministry and primitive doctrines we would that we now had the primitive means and agencies in their fullness and perfection for the promotion of Christianity, unless there might possibly arise here and there some rare case of obvious necessity for departing from them. But defective as our branch of the Church Catholic is, it is nevertheless obviously and in the very nature of the case the only religious denomination in the land which is organically capable of setting forth the primitive doctrines in their fullness and purity, and of legitimately employing the primitive means and agencies in their true and complete efficiency. In other words, if the primitive type of Christianity is ever to be presented to this people, in the Providence of God, it is peculiarly and exclusively our work, since all other religious organizations must abandon their distinctive peculiarities, and become essentially different from what they now are before it would be possible for them to do it.

A return to small Dioceses, as an important means of promoting the growth of the Church in this country, has been so generally advocated amongst us in all quarters, that we need not dwell long upon this subject. Most of the discussion, however, has been in favor of what have been called "See Bishoprics"—Dioceses in which the Bishop of each should have his residence and cathedral in the principal city. To adopt this theory exclusively would be to apportion all the rural districts amongst the several cities of our land. This certainly would be a grand improvement on the method of erecting Dioceses which has hitherto prevailed.

But in addition to this, we would advocate the erecting also of small Country Dioceses, and for the following reasons: We have precedents to warrant such a course in the example of the Primitive Church; the Episcopal supervision would be more thorough and effectual; it would be more in harmony with the practice of our people generally, who are accustomed to transact their business of a public and general character in their own immediate localities, as far as possible, and it would, moreover, tend to attract other Christian denominations towards ourselves. The importance of this last consideration especially is justly entitled to much more space than we can devote to it in this connection.

Nearly all the denominations of the land have some local organizations which hold about the same relations to the whole body in each respective case, that our individual parishes do to our whole Church. In other words, the religious denominations of the country rely chiefly on what may be called the parochial system for the propagation of Christianity.

Without attempting to trace its history far back into the past, we on our part have derived it immediately from a mixture of the *State establishment* in the Church of England, not of it, with the surrounding *Congregationalism* of this country, both of which are justly distasteful to the true American Churchman; and both of which were entirely unknown to the Primitive Church. No resemblance of either can be found until the latter part of the fifth century.* And it is encouraging to know that there are serious objections felt to them, in various quarters in the Church which from time to time are cautiously expressed.

* Bingham's *Christian Antiquities*, Book V. Chap. vi. Sec. 5, Book IX. Chap. viii. Sec. 6.

We do not propose, however, to make war upon this system. We only complain that the Church in this country which especially prides itself upon its primitive character, its enlarged liberality and comprehensiveness, should have adopted this modern invention, as the chief instrumentality for the spread of the Gospel, and have made it so solely the basis of all its ecclesiastical enactments as to utterly ignore all the organic agencies of the Primitive Church.* At first thought this appears like some strange picture of the fancy, or as a dream when one awaketh. It is difficult and actually costs an effort of the understanding to believe the existence of such a state of things. And yet it is a reality which is familiar to us all. Organized parishes are the sole basis of Lay Representation in our Diocesan Conventions, and if not in theory, it is nevertheless practically the principal one of Clerical Representation also; and the representation in our General Convention is essentially on the same basis. Under our constitution and canons, without Parishes, a full Church council—composed of clergy and laity—would be an utter impossibility. Now as we before said, it is not our object to make war upon this novel feature in our Church, but only to plead that those primitive agencies, which have been thoroughly tested, and with the most encouraging results, should henceforth also be recognized, tolerated, and encouraged as co-ordinate agencies.

Whatever may be the developments of the future, we must evidently for the present, and probably for a long time to come, rely chiefly upon the agencies and wealth of our Parishes to carry on the Church work both at home and abroad. Hence it would be not only wrong in principle, but really suicidal to provoke them to become a hostile party in the Church. But if any other instrumentalities can be introduced more effective for the spread of the Gospel and the salvation of souls, or better calculated to perform any particular religious work, we are fully persuaded that they would not only most heartily bid them God speed, but tender them any aid in their power.

The Church has been truly tolerant to her individual members, and to the numerous voluntary societies which they have organized amongst themselves for the promotion of Christianity. But these

* Such agencies as necessarily belong to the very existence of the Church, are not of course here included.

do not happen to come into collision with her organic laws. Were this also true of the agencies for which we plead, they doubtless could have as free toleration, and as great a degree of encouragement as any others. Even the work of returning to small Dioceses, which is now so much in favor in all quarters, is rendered literally impossible by our present ecclesiastical enactments, except in certain favored localities. But the primitive instrumentalities which we ardently desire should be readopted, and which all utterly excluded from the Church by her canons, are especially a *common work* and a *common support* for her Clergy.

Out of these would naturally grow many other very important and much needed agencies and influences, which we cannot here consider. This was the method ordained by God Himself under the former dispensation. It was also adopted at the outset by the inspired Apostles themselves, for the Christian Church. And never was the Christian spirit felt and exhibited with such power and loveliness as at the very beginning, when as we read, "All that believed were together and had all things common, and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men as every man had need," Acts ii. 45. What a total forgetfulness of self and a supreme regard for the welfare of others were here exhibited! No one lived for himself, but for others, while he had the blessedness of knowing, that all in like manner were living for him. Now that this state of things was to be perpetuated in the Church amongst all classes of Christians, we do not insist. But, we do maintain that the Ambassadors of Jesus Christ, who are especially called upon to exhibit in their lives the best possible type of Christianity, should have ever perpetuated this most lovely example of the primitive Christians in all its essential features. And this they everywhere did for several centuries until selfishness and self-aggrandizement, under other and specious names, introduced the elements of our modern Parochial system. The method here proposed of a *common work* and a *common support* was the only one known in the Church for several of the first centuries of its existence, and the only method practiced during the entire period of her greatest prosperity.

And yet when a return to it is proposed, we meet not only with ecclesiastical enactments, which are absolutely insuperable, until repealed or greatly modified, but also with various objections on

the part of private individuals, which are the result of mistaken views, and have no foundation in reality. One is, that it would rob the Church of its present popular and representative character. It is indeed very justly the delight of every true American Churchman, that our own branch of the Apostolic Church is more popular in its government than any other in existence. And yet it is no more so than many branches of the Primitive Church. In many of its Dioceses certainly, and we think in most of them, the vote of the layman, then, as well as with us, had its proper share of influence in determining who should be consecrated to the Episcopate, and become the chief Shepherd of the flock.

The basis of lay representation must of course have been different from what it now is, and we can easily believe, that while it was equally popular, it was far more just. Hence nothing would be thus lost in the popular character of the Church, while the evils of our present system might be chiefly avoided.

Again, it is objected that this method is so opposed to our established usages, as well as to the usages of the people generally, as to render it entirely unsuited to the present condition of the Church and country.

It is freely admitted that such a course would not be in harmony with the prevailing sectarian influences in the land, but we are by no means bound to take these as our guide; on the contrary, whatever erroneous practices we have imbibed from them, it is our duty as consistent Churchmen to renounce and forsake. Furthermore we are by no means bound to be guided by secular and civil institutions, for the Church is quite competent to legislate for herself. But nevertheless, when we turn to our civil institutions to make comparisons we find that the usages are quite analogous to those we would have adopted in the Church. The members of our national Congress—the highest legislative body in the land—have a *common work* to do for the whole country, while they receive a *common support* from the whole country. Again the members of our State Legislatures have a *common work* to do for the State, and a *common support* from the State. Other examples of a like character might be adduced, but these are sufficient to show that the plan of *common work and common support* would not only be not hostile to the institutions and usages of the country, but quite in harmony with them.

And moreover, while it is admitted that this method might prove quite efficient in missionary labors, it has been objected that it would prove deficient in power to conserve what is gained. How extensively this objection is felt we do not know, and had it never been endorsed by high authority, we should not enter upon the consideration of it here.

That the work in a Diocese should be in any good degree common, necessarily implies that the Diocese should be so small that the Bishop could have a personal and practical oversight of all its interests, even in their minutest details. Now as Bishops are chosen with an especial reference to their peculiar fitness for their office, and receive the wisest of counsel from their peers, while they command all the aid, counsel and co-operation their respective Dioceses afford; to say that any interest whatever of their jurisdiction cannot be as well conserved in connection with a common work and a common support, as under our Parochial system, is to say that each individual Parish of a Diocese embodies more wisdom and practical talent than the House of Bishops, and the respective Dioceses combined, which is hardly supposable.

We now propose to institute a comparison between this primitive method of labor and support and the one which we have adopted, and point out some of the advantages which would be gained, and some of the evils which would be avoided by adopting it.

It will be sufficient for our purpose to institute this comparison under two general heads :

The Services Rendered the Church, and

The Use of the Revenues of the Church.

And first—With reference to services rendered the Church, both by the clergy and laity :

The desire has already become very strong amongst us in all quarters for a return to small Dioceses as a means of securing more efficient Episcopal supervision, which it would undoubtedly do. But under present influences our Bishops are held too much aloof from their Dioceses, whether large or small, for us to fully realize the practical working and great beauty of the primitive system. In that, although the Bishop was the Spiritual Father, the whole body of the Clergy formed a most lovely brotherhood. The Bishop, being then much more than at the present time a fel-

low-laborer with his Presbyters, conferred with them on all occasions, and seldom did anything of great weight and moment without their advice and approval; that so there might be the greater force and authority to all public acts done in the name of the Church. Hence St. Chrysostom and Synesius style them, "the court or Sanhedrim of the Presbyters;" Cyprian, "the sacred and venerable bench of the clergy;" St. Jerome and others, "the Church's Senate," and "the Senate of the Church;" Origen, "the Bishop's counselors." So that when the Bishop acted the whole body of his clergy acted through him. He went not forth single-handed and alone, as is now too much the case, but was supported by the influence and authority of the whole body of the clergy.

The Bishop thus laboring and sharing the responsibilities in common with his Clergy, would naturally if not necessarily know more of the circumstances and wants of any place than he could be expected to know under the present parochial system, which makes the authority of the Rector of each Parish supreme and exclusive, except on occasions of the Bishop's official acts. Hence, let the size of the Diocese be what it may, under our present system, the people of each Parish will almost certainly be deprived of much Episcopal supervision, which it is their right to have, and which they would naturally receive under the original order of things in the Christian Church. And this is a circumstance which should never be lost sight of by those who are desirous (as every true Churchman is) of securing to the Church the full benefit of Episcopal labors and supervision.

Again, the same principle would apply in rendering the services of the Presbyterian more efficient as in the case of the Bishop. He also would go forth not as an individual Clergyman simply, but likewise supported by the whole influence and authority of the entire body of the Clergy. The present system isolates each individual Clergyman from the rest, and localizes his labors and his influence, whether they be well suited to the people for whom he labors or not, whereas, the primitive system with a central council to lay out the work and appoint the laborers for it, would secure a fitness between the work to be done and the laborers who should perform it.

As a general rule, whenever a new field is to be entered, its peculiarities and wants call for the ablest men the Church can fur-

nish, and who shall be practically sustained and strengthened in their position by the authority and influence of the whole Diocese. But instead of this, such places, for the most part, fall into the hands of those who have but just entered the ministry, who are therefore destitute of all experience in their profession, who have acquired no ministerial character or influence to take along with them, and who are scarcely encouraged and strengthened at all by any influence the Church furnishes them; and it usually results, as might naturally be expected, in but little accomplished for the Church, and in a very sad and trying experience to the young minister, who is a thousandfold more to be pitied than blamed for his want of a greater measure of success. Sometimes, however, such places fall into the hands of superannuated or otherwise inefficient Clergymen, who are not desired in more eligible positions, with no better results for the furtherance of the work.

The primitive system, moreover, would have a grand advantage over the present, in that it could more readily adapt itself to the changing circumstances within the bounds of each Diocese. In the new portions of our country, particularly in our mining districts, missionaries are sent out and stationed at points of great promise, and parishes organized, when suddenly a population of five hundred or a thousand souls, has become dispersed to points of greater attraction, and the work, which was begun under such encouraging prospects, is broken up. On such fields especially we need a system which will adapt itself to the ever-varying circumstances incident thereto. And this can be found only by adopting the model of the Apostolic Church, and sending Bishops as the pioneers, who shall gather around them such other Clergy as the labor demands, they being bound by no local organizations, and laboring wherever and as, the Bishop, being on the ground (and not hundreds, and sometimes thousands, of miles off, like our Missionary Committees), shall see fit to direct.

With our Church Wardens and lay readers, we have so far lost sight of the true work and office of Deacons, that practically we scarcely have them in our system at all, which is already felt to be a great oversight and a great evil. With here and there an exception, we at once impose upon the Deacon the principal part of the duties and responsibilities of the Presbyter.

Now, by restoring the primitive order of things we reinstate this

most worthy class of laborers in their proper office, and commit to them again their proper duties.

Besides these three orders in the ministry the early Church had various classes or orders of the laity, both men and women, who were enrolled in her active service, each class or order having its own appropriate work to do. So in these times we need the active service of our laity. But we shall never enjoy it, we fear, in any good degree of efficiency, till they can be brought into proper organizations, duly manned with officers, and all under the general guidance and supervision of the Bishop. It is scarcely less necessary for efficiency that the individual Christians of the Church be banded together, and act in concert, than it is for the privates of an army. What could we expect of them, if each one was left to make war upon the enemy only when and as he should choose? Besides, there is always a grand advantage gained in a good cause in bearing a representative character. For example, an individual Bishop carries a weighty influence with him over and above what he may be personally entitled to, from the simple fact that he belongs to a class eminent for their virtues, their talents, and their learning. The same principle holds true in the case of the Presbyter and Deacon. Why should it not also in the case of a lay-member of the Church, who is known to belong to, and represent some worthy and pious society or order of Christians? But in the great majority of our Parishes we never can have efficient organizations answering to those in the Primitive Church for want of the material out of which to form them. And hence we stand so isolated from each other and, (I am sorry to say), from the wicked world around us, that comparatively little is done. But break down all local barriers, and throw the whole Diocese into one common field, and all these obstacles to more efficient organizations amongst the laity and corresponding efficient services at once disappear.

Under this first general head we will notice one topic more before passing to the other.

It has become a subject of almost constant and universal complaint, that so many of our Clergy are out of regular employment in their profession, while at the same time there are so many parishes vacant and extremely desirous of securing the regular ministrations of the Church. But, in cases like these, the clergy are

usually in no fault. When one, having become providentially out of regular employment, is desirous of taking charge of a Parish, it often happens that many long, weary, anxious months pass away before he can secure a position in any degree suited to him. Many a Bishop may be desirous of his services within his own jurisdiction. We may indeed recommend him to certain Parishes, but such recommendations as is well known are but too often disregarded. Besides, in all our overgrown Dioceses, such cases are liable to be soon overlooked and forgotten by the Bishops. If the unemployed Clergyman is a Christian gentleman of becoming modesty, (which we are certainly to suppose), he can hardly be expected to resort to the business of place-hunting from Parish to Parish, and perhaps from Diocese to Diocese. So he must wait, in anxious solicitude, and consume his scanty substance, until he receives a call which he deems it his duty to accept. But, were the work of a Diocese all one and in common, and all under the immediate control of the Bishop and his counsellors, it can be seen at a glance that a clergyman need not wait a day for regular employment in his Master's cause. And this is a subject well worthy of serious consideration, as the Church cannot afford to lose such an amount of valuable service.

2d. We will now institute a comparison between the different methods of using the Church's revenues.

The need of funds to support the Gospel has always been a want deeply felt in the Church. Hence the great necessity and obligation of making the best possible use of them.

The primitive method gathered the revenues into one common fund for each Diocese, and thence disbursed them for all church objects, according to their respective importance and necessities. The present method is for each locality to raise funds for its own use, and appropriate them for that end, and usually without the counsel or even the knowledge of the Bishop and the higher ecclesiastical authorities of the Diocese.

Our Missionary Committees do indeed come somewhat to the aid of this system, rendering it more tolerable than it would otherwise be, but at best we must believe that it abounds in very sad defects.

We begin again with the Episcopate, the head and front of our Church system.

That we need more Bishops to secure an adequate Episcopal supervision is a want sadly felt, but how we can support them is the principal problem to be solved. With a system that looks after almost every other interest before that of the maintenance of the Episcopate, it does indeed become a very difficult matter. But under the primitive system, whether the Bishop were the first missionary upon any new field or not, as he ordinarily should be, if we mistake not, he was invariably made with certain other church officers, as his advisers and assistants, the treasurer and almoner of the Church's revenues, thus carrying out the same principle which was first established, when the disciples sold their possessions, and all in common laid their money at the Apostles' feet, out of which distribution was made unto every man according as he had need. Then the very idea of the Episcopate involved that of the support of the Bishop of some sort or kind. That it was in affluence and ease we do not pretend. And looking at this matter in the light of the earliest ages of the Church, we certainly should not judge that this was the design. The great Bishop and Shepherd of our souls Himself was so poor that He had not where to lay his head. And when He sent forth the original Apostles it was with the command, "Provide neither gold nor silver, nor brass in your purses." Matt. x. 9. And the Apostle St. Paul whom He afterwards so miraculously called, was willing to suffer the loss of all things temporal, that so he might win Christ, and he actually wrought with his own hands for his support. And very similar was the experience of the immediate successors of the Apostles, so that it would seem that the dignity, the honor, and the usefulness of the Apostolic office, consisted not in the affluence with which it was supported, but rather in the faithfulness and efficacy with which it was used. And it cannot be doubted that there are many ministers in the Church, with eminent qualifications for the Bishopric, who would not only not shrink from an unendowed Episcopate, but would count it a privilege, at the expense of any privation and self-denial, to be accounted worthy to follow in the footsteps of such predecessors, who would rather count it a joy than a hardship to live with their clergy, from the common treasury of the Church, however scanty that might be. But it needs no words to show that if the Church would adopt the principle of a common support for the whole body of her clergy, she could as readily support Bishops as Presbyters and Deacons.

Upon this principle it is also obvious, that the support of the other orders of the Clergy would be more just and equitable, while at the same time it would save some of them many large and unnecessary expenses, which, under the present system, the customs of society demand.

As it now is, a large amount of funds are squandered in church building enterprises. Is a church edifice required at a missionary station? The general rule is, that the missionary must leave his flock for months together, to solicit the needed aid from more favored portions of the Church, meanwhile necessarily incurring such heavy expenses, that his receipts are oftentimes more than consumed by them. And when the money has once been acquired in this slow, tedious and expensive manner, it is often largely squandered for want of architectural knowledge and experience on the part of those who have the spending of it, both in unchurchly, and needlessly expensive edifices. On the primitive principle no clergyman was obliged to wander from city to city, and from Diocese to Diocese, until he had traversed a large part of a vast continent, but a certain portion of the Church revenues were appropriated to the building and repairing of church edifices, which fell into the hands of judicious and competent persons for its outlay.

Under our parochial system, in certain favored localities, particularly in our cities, it is common for Parishes to vie with each other in the costliness and magnificence of their churches, often incurring heavy debts to the great detriment of general church interests, which very much need their aid. On the primitive principle, the Bishop's Church or Cathedral, in wealthy Dioceses especially, would very naturally and properly be one of elegance, magnificence and architectural perfections. All alike feeling a special interest in this would diminish the desire for costly churches in every particular locality, while an equitable distribution of the common church building funds would provide all with suitable places of worship at a comparatively moderate expense, and so at the same time, both avoid the evil of indebtedness and save a great amount of funds for carrying forward the general work.

Under the present Parochial system, the erecting of our extravagantly expensive city churches and supporting only our especial favorites to minister at their altars, seems to us quite too much like rearing temples to our own pride and self-glory, and offering sacri-

legious homage to Paul and Apollos. If it were our design to make war upon this system, we might urge many objections against it which we regard as of a very serious character. We will only insist, however, in this connection, that it is intolerant, unreasonable and unjust, that the Church, without any real necessity for it, should compel us to assist in maintaining what is so contrary to primitive usage, what is so much in the way of her own prosperity, which we have deeply at heart, and especially what is so grossly a violation of our own principles. The present is a period of revolutions and changes generally throughout the world. And there are unmistakable indications that there must and will be important changes in the Church. And although they may not be altogether desirable, it is rather the part of wisdom to try to guide them in the right direction and to some good end, than to try to prevent them altogether. And shall the changes be made by re-adopting what have been fully proven to be the most efficient agencies the Church has ever used, or by entering upon a series of experiments which may bring upon us greater evils than any we are at present suffering, and, for this very reason, in a comparatively short time to be exchanged for something else? Many, doubtless very many, heartily desire changes in the direction of primitive usages, but doubt the expediency of attempting them at present. We propose then to show *wherein* and *how* we regard such changes practicable.

In the first place, it is very obvious, if there were no ecclesiastical enactments in the way, that it is, at least, just as easy to take up fields already unoccupied by the Church on the primitive plan as on any other. Instead of retarding the Church's work in all our unoccupied territory by fastening upon coming generations the gross evils of our present system, thereby standing in the way of the salvation of a countless number of immortal souls, it would be perfectly easy for our House of Bishops to appoint over small jurisdictions such persons as are desirous of re-establishing the primitive instrumentalities in place of what we now have, with permission to ignore the parochial system, and to invite such of the clergy as are like-minded with themselves to a common work and a common support, and in due time to the re-establishing of all the various orders of laborers, both men and women, and in short all the agencies common in the Primitive Church.

We have but just begun to take possession of this vast country,

even within the bounds of most of our older Dioceses, but so deeply do we deprecate the melancholy results of fastening upon our new territories especially, so vast in extent, and destined to be inhabited by so many millions, all the evils of our older Dioceses, that we cannot refrain from raising our voices against it. And in Dioceses already established, we maintain that the evil we have already incorporated into our system ought to be everywhere at once arrested; that there should be no more parishes organized; that all future accessions to the Church outside of present parochial organizations should be under the immediate supervision and control of the Bishop and his canonical advisers; that their contributions for the support of the Clergy should not be paid directly to those who minister unto them, but into a general fund to be disbursed under the supervision of the Bishop, as in the primitive times, for their benefit; that the parishes in the Diocese, and particularly those which are unable to support full services for themselves, should be encouraged to give up their parochial organizations, pay all their contributions for the support of the Clergy into a common fund, and look to the Bishop to furnish them their proper quota of stated services; that those parishes, particularly the wealthy ones, which are not willing to give up their organizations should contribute to the common fund according to their ability and the demands upon it, and that that portion of the Diocese not organized into parishes should have all its different localities and interests equitably represented by delegates in the Diocesan councils. Could a plan like this be inaugurated by a Bishop thoroughly in earnest, to reinstate the primitive instrumentalities of the Church in his Diocese, although it would necessarily be entered upon under many disadvantages, we have no doubt that alongside of the parochial system, working as it now does, it would prove itself in due time far more efficient for the furtherance of the interests of the Church and the consequent salvation of souls.

We therefore maintain that our General Convention ought, at its very next session, to take the necessary steps for removing all obstructions either in the Constitution or Canons of the Church in the way of establishing new Dioceses at once in our Missionary Jurisdiction on the primitive plan, also to remove all obstructions in the way of introducing into the Dioceses already formed, the primitive usages and instrumentalities as co-ordinate with those which we now employ to their exclusion.

ART. VII.—PERVERTS AND REVERTS.

THE INVITATION HEEDED : Reasons for a return to Catholic Unity :
by *James Kent Stone* : New York : *The Catholic Publication Society*. 1870.

True faith is an infinite blessing to man, and the certitude of that faith adds a satisfying stability to the soul of its possessor. When, however, any circumstance occurs which tends to disturb the security of that certitude, how it shocks the simple and confiding soul, how it bewilders and confounds the unsophisticated and sincere disciple of Christ ! Many times, of late years, has the FAITH of the Church been exposed to doubt by the very men whose lives, learning and vows have been pledged to support it against all assailants. Our hearts have been wrung to the core by beholding men of position, parts and learning ; men with every seeming of virtue, devotion, piety and sincerity ; men who have spent the very flower of their youth and the mature experience of their manhood in teaching the great and sublime verities of the faith to thousands of confiding souls, in schools, parishes, and colleges, till they have won the confidence of thousands, in the meanwhile, seeming to stand as pillars of truth, when suddenly they face round and tell their astonished admirers, OUR WHOLE LIVES HAVE BEEN A LIE.

Such an unlooked-for recreancy raises wonder, disappointment and chagrin. The shock is felt in the inner soul of our manhood. Men stare aghast, are silent with astonishment ; they hang their heads from the very feelings of pungent sorrow, only saying, "Surely there is no faith in the earth—and all religion is a sham !"

What would we say of a brave and successful general, who had spent his life in the field, and had led his confiding comrades to a hundred battles and triumphs ; but at last meeting a formidable enemy, and instead of doing his duty in the face of his foe, he should square round saying, "My brave men, my whole career has been a mistake, my tactics are all wrong. I now sheath my trusty sword. I now abandon the cause of my country and give myself up to the enemy ; follow me, for I will betray you to the foe." The instincts of mankind would execrate his name.

Could one, during the last quarter of a century, have taken his seat in the sun, like the woman in the Apocalypse, and looked down

upon the road stretching from Canterbury to Rome, what a stream of pilgrims he would have beheld going and coming, jostling and crowding, advancing and returning between these two venerable representative cities! There would have been seen youth in their teens tickled with novelty, scions of old aristocratic houses hunting for gorgeous display, malcontents dissatisfied with everything, disappointed speculators of all ages and grades, men *bona fide* and men *mala fide*, and here and there a few bending with the weight of years, whose silvery locks, wan countenances, and intelligent faces evince their long labor in the study, the closet and the parish; but all alike, with very few exceptions, doomed in the end to the chagrin and bitterness of disappointment, and some few to utter despair.

With a smile of pity, he would exclaim, why is all this bustle? Cui bono? Still they come and go, like the ever-rolling stone, the vain task of Sisyphus, pierced with the ever-thrusting and retreating thorn, beguiled by the ever-flowing and receding tide. Among these pilgrims would be seen the Rev. J. K. Stone, quondam President of Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio: and of Hobart College, Geneva, New York; bearing in his hand the Pope's INVITATION inscribed, "Ad unitatem sedis apostolicæ, divina gratia duce, reversus sum."

It is a patent fact, that Mr. Stone is a son of the American branch of the Anglican MOTHER. In her he was born, nurtured, cared for, watched over, and fed, till he became a man in Christ. Under her fostering maternity he was educated, confirmed, and ordained to take part of her ministry. In her parishes he was accustomed to feed her tender lambs, and guide her obedient sheep. Albeit, in due time, he was intrusted with the high and responsible duty of educating her youth;—in this post of confiding trust he stood many years.

But suddenly, as the result of the reaction of his own idiosyncrasy, he shoots straight away to Rome, in spite of all the superlative claims of truth of doctrine and purity of worship in his venerable mother Church, leaving a book behind him traducing her fair and beautiful character. "He that curseth father or mother, let him die the death."

A strange coincidence presents itself just here. On Mr. Stone's pilgrimage to Rome, he meets a company of fellow-pilgrims returning from Rome to Canterbury, where they were made Chris-

tians, in common with Mr. Stone. This returning group comprise an Oxfordshire Vicar, a very learned and celebrated layman, both of whom had resided in the eternal city for twenty-five years; in the same group are seen a disappointed English Lord, two or three young ritualists, and a Roman Catholic Priest, of many years' standing, all vexed, disappointed and sad for the folly of having once, like Mr. Stone, forsaken the Church of their childhood. They salute each other, with an exchange of compliments according to the propriety of etiquette, and after a short interview, in which they declare briefly each to the other, that they have cut aloose from their moorings, all at sea together, and that each is steering his own course by himself alone, and that course, for the future, is in contrary ways. What a scene to behold! It is enough to shake the faith of the feeble, and the strong! It will make angels weep. It gives the laugh to the indifferent, and encouragement to the infidel.

We have, in the case before us, a sad instance of that deep-laid and wide-spread law of the human mind called *reaction*. The mind, like an over-strung bow, or like an over-charged gun, will rebound, and recoil upon itself.

These reactions are full of instruction to the reflecting mind. They are in the Church and out of it;—they appear in the individual man as well as in the mass; they have come down from the primitive times. Truth and heresy, faith and unbelief, unity and schism have run side by side from the beginning. The curious reader of Church history learns to know, that as sure as Ebionitism, or a Judaizing Christianity, produced by the reaction of itself, Gnosticism, or a philosophizing Christianity, so that again produced Manichæism, and that by reaction Sabellianism, and the like, through the whole career of the Church. Dr. Newman begun as a lax churchman, and by the law of reaction landed in Rome. So did Lord Bute; so did Mr. Stone. Loose churchmanship ignores all distinctive principles, and in fact makes the Church nothing;—but when the reaction comes then there is no resting or halting short of infallibility.

Mr. Stone, viewing the Church from his first stand-point, has a peculiar *penchant* for making her *intensely protestant*. He ignores entirely the historic significance of the term. He uses it as a synonyme for objective faith, and wholly overlooks the fact,

that the term, as used in the English Church, and in the Protestant Episcopal Church, is a bare abstract negation, a mere protest against heresy and schism. The Church is protestant only in regard to heresy and schism, in every other sense she is *catholic*. The word *catholic*, and not "*protestant*," is the countersign in her creeds and symbols; in a word, the term, the idea, and the thought pervades the whole of her nomenclature, her history, theology, liturgy and polity. She is made to be *intensely* protestant, in the objective sense, only for party purposes. He describes himself as "*a veritable and unmitigated Protestant*," p. 64. This ideal of the Church he has carried with him to Rome. In his view, the term "*protestant*" is identical with the status of the Church of England, and of sects, and of the Protestant Episcopal Church. We have read parts of Mr. Stone's book with sadness and pity for him, where he refers to the Church of England. He ignores entirely her apostolic origin, her local position, her great antiquity, her early recognition by the councils of the Church, her wide-spread primitive missions, her church essentials, her early struggles with Rome, her power of self-reformation, her final triumph, her noble army of martyrs, her unrivalled literature, her deep and fervent saintliness, her state conflicts, her calm defence against the assaults of dissent and infidelity, her present strength, her world-wide missions, her glorious future, and especially her true catholic character.

While Mr. Stone, disingenuously, as we think, persistently confounds the Church with the sects, and intensifies the term protestant as though it were the most important word in her calendar, he at the same time, with adroit *naïveté*, separates the term ROMAN from the word Catholic, so as to be free to represent the Roman Communion as THE CATHOLIC CHURCH, in place of the Roman Catholic Church, as she is defined to be in the tenth article of the Creed of Pope Pius IV. Why is this? Why do brethren of that communion, both in speaking and writing, uniformly ignore, with a kind of *mauvaise honte*, as though almost half afraid to use their own self-chosen and authoritative terms, terms found in their creeds and formularies; yet, at the same time, describe our *branch* of the Catholic Church as though she were a mere protestant sect? Is such conduct kind, wise, just and good? Surely Mr. Stone knows better than this. Though we really suspect from the tenor

of much of his book, whether he ever thoroughly understood the Church he has abandoned. If so, he criticises without facts, discriminates without skill, condemns without justice, and pronounces upon what he has never examined, more like a charlatan than a judge.

We justify ourselves in this apprehension because he uniformly speaks of the Church of England as the mere child of the reformation, as the creature of Henry the VIII., by whose caprices and character he colors the Church of the Reformation. Now a man who thoroughly understands the historic identity, and continuity of the Anglican Church, never could write or speak so, of her, except as a false witness. *Fiat justitia!*

We very seriously doubt whether Mr. Stone ever comprehended the true polity and Catholic character of the Anglican Church; whether he ever read and understood thoroughly her Creeds and Articles; but especially the XXth Article. If he ever did, he ought to have been more candid; but if he did not, then he ought not to have written the following, which certainly evinces a lack of candor and fairness:

* "Protestants in general appeal from the voice of the living Church to the written text of Scripture. In doing so, they, of course, deny that there is now in the world any visible divinely established tribunal to whose authority they are bound to submit their own opinions in matters of faith. * * * * Who told Cranmer and Ridley that holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation?" etc. p. 139.

To sustain his position, as to the Reformation giving birth to the Church of England, and per consequence to our American Church, Mr. Stone quotes copiously and exultingly from Lord Macaulay, who exists in Mr. Stone's imagination as the *beau ideal* of all authority, beauty and excellence. Perhaps no man, in Church matters, has written so absurdly as Macaulay: nor does Mr. Stone, we may fairly presume, fully comprehend the caprices of the witness he quotes so often and with so much éclat. For, with the same stroke of the pen, by which he belittles the Church of England, he affects to sweep away the succession from Rome, in order that he may invalidate the ministry and sacraments of the Church of England. In a word, Macaulay blows hot and cold with the same breath, yes and no in the same answer; white is black and black is white by the simple touch of pen, and, of course,

Mr. Stone believes him, so long as he abets himself in the abuse of his ancient mother. Macaulay affirms that "it is *impossible* for either England or Rome to trace the succession." That "the Arians have an equal claim to the unbroken succession." Were this the place to review Mr. Macaulay, we could and would show him to have been the most contradictory and inconsistent of all men! And the only one advantage Mr. Stone can gain, is the support to his argument, by a writer of great popularity in this country, and so make him, by a kind of side wind, endorse his book! Rome, on the one hand, and Dissent, on the other, never tire of using Lord Macaulay *against* the Church, seemingly wholly oblivious of the fact, that he has said as many or more absurd things against each of them than he has against the Church of which he was indeed an unworthy member.

Mr. Stone's chapter on INFALLIBILITY, may be called one of simple self-assertion and self-assumption, without to us, one single clear and forcible argument in its defence. He assumes, by a kind of paranomasia that *the* Catholic Church is, and must be the Church of Rome, which, however, he nowhere attempts to prove, in the proper sense of logical proof. Now we ask, what is the value of bare, naked self-assertion? Does self-assertion make the man to be the thing he asserts himself? Let us try it in a few cases. As early as the third year of the forty-second Olympiad, Heraclitus, the Ephesian Philosopher, asserted himself to be omniscient; "he asserted, that he himself knew every thing, and the rest of mankind knew nothing." Will any man believe, that the simple, self-assertion of this philosopher made him omniscient? Again, Louis the XIVth, of France, *Le grand monarch*, used to say of himself, L' ETAT C' EST MOI; but did that self-assertion make him the state? The notorious Robert Owen said, "the whole world is divided into two classes, viz: fools and knaves," and that he himself was "the only wise man, sacred to truth, and without mixture of error." But who believes this self-assertion to be anything more than the mere proclamation of one's own folly? So the holy father, Pope Pius the IXth, now in the nineteenth century of the Christian era, without miracle, and without invincible argument, and by his own assumed self-assertion alone, proclaims himself infallible! But, says Mr. Stone, the assertion of infallibility is infallibility! Eheu! He says:

"There can be only one infallible Church. There is one only church which claims infallibility. The assertion of such a claim puts instantly an infinite distance between the church which makes it and all other institutions whatsoever. A society which admits its fallibility confesses itself human; an organization which assumes its own inerrancy claims to be divine. Claims, did I say? The very fact of such a claim is proof of its validity." P. 120.

The fallacy of *non sequitur* underlies the entire assumption of infallibility. It is presumed that he who pronounces an infallible dogma must himself be infallible. This fallacy Dr. Johnson annihilated on an occasion when the old trite doggerel was quoted in his hearing, thus:

"Let slaves that would be free themselves first strike the blow,"

which he, in a sally of wit so common to him, instantly parodied, thus:

"He that would fat oxen slay himself must first be fat,"

so in like manner it is presumed that he who would pronounce infallible truth must himself be infallible, which is the fallacy we here expose. Let us try it: for e. g.,

Sir Isaac Newton discovered and demonstrated an infallible truth, did that make him infallible? Balaam uttered infallible truth, was he therefore infallible? Judas taught infallible truth, was Judas infallible? The Nicene council defined infallible truth, after which we know two of the three hundred and eighteen Bishops fell into the Arian heresy; the truth was infallible while they were fallible. One only is infallible who declared Himself to be the *Truth*, and His *Word* to be *Truth*, and all besides are fallible and errant, otherwise we confound the truth with the oracle that utters it, neglecting a distinction the Church has observed in all ages; except the Church of Rome, which, in the ninth century, for the first time, conceived and arrogated to herself, and now, after a long course of ages, after excommunicating two-thirds of Christendom, and finding herself alone and isolated, and to justify her lonely position, declares herself, at this late hour of her history, to be infallible, in the august personage of Pope Pius the Ninth.

But there is another difficulty in the way of Mr. Stone's self-asserted assumption, which is this—are we quite sure that we shall have no more difficulty in understanding the ex-cathedra utterances of an assumed infallible Pope, than we have in understand-

ing Him who is TRUTH itself, Jesus Christ? Why cannot any ordinary man understand the plain text of Scripture, or the writings of the early Fathers, as well as a Pope's decree? It is said ordinary scholars do not agree as to the interpretation of Scripture. May it not be said also that scholars of the Roman Catholic Church differ very widely as to Papal dogmas? Any man who is but slightly acquainted with the controversies between the Thomists and Scotists, the Dominicans and Franciscans, the Jansenists and Jesuits, the Gallicans and the Ultramontanists, etc., knows this. What, then, do we gain by appealing from Christ and Paul to the Pope?

Mr. Stone's appeal to *antiquity* is more amusing than convincing. Like his often applauded exemplar, Abp. Manning, he considers that "the appeal to antiquity is treason and heresy." The nearer perverts approach to Rome the further they get from Scripture and the primitive fathers. They uniformly deny the paramount authority of the Word of God, and overlook the force of the writings of the apostolic fathers, and also those of the apologetic period. The reason for this is obvious to every reflecting, unprejudiced mind, viz., that both the Word of God and the apostolic fathers, who are the exponents of apostolic teaching, and are the nearest to the pure fountain of inspiration, are remarkable for their lack of support of the Papal system. Hence they belittle those primitive teachers, as they have comparatively nothing which they can use in support of the modern novelties and innovations of Romanism. He says:

"For a believer in revelation to quote the Scriptures against the church which gives him the Scriptures, and which certifies their divine origin, is irrational enough; but for a believer in a Catholic Church to appeal to the past against the present, and to attempt to judge the Church of the nineteenth century by the church of the third, is, if possible, more irrational still." P. 157.

It seems a matter of course to the Romanist, that, compared with the assumed infallible certitude of the Church's interpretation, the words of Christ, the writings of John, the epistles of Sts. Paul, Peter, and James are a mere bagatelle. The writings of Clement of Rome, Polycarp, Ignatius, Barnabas, Hermas, and Papias, are a mere ragbag of scraps of theology. These writings are dry breasts, empty wells to the antiquary of the Roman Catholic Church. Indeed, it would be no difficult task to draw from

the scabbards of these primitive fathers those two-edged swords, that would quickly sever from Rome forever all her superincumbent overgrowths of modern times.

Nor are the fathers of the apologetic age much more appreciated. The theology of the men, filling the period from the beginning of the second to the end of the third century, had but a small modicum of support for Rome; and what is gained from that is mainly gained by a forced interpretation, or by construing mere aphoristic expressions into definitions of logical formula. Rome's pretences cannot be built up from the voluminous works of Justin Martyr, Theophilus, Irenæus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Novatian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Hippolytus and others of that period. These men of the purest age, of the most fervent piety and of courageous martyrdom, are as so many *ignes fatui* to Rome's pretensions. One stumbling-block thrown in the path of the student of antiquity, by Mr. Stone, is, that "men must differ in the interpretation of antiquity as much as they do in the interpretation of Scripture." He seems perfectly oblivious to the possible fact that men will differ, also, as to the dogmatic utterances of a *soi-disant* infallible Pope. Have not Roman Catholic scholars of all ages differed as wide as the poles among themselves as to Rome's own distinctive teachings and dogmas? Have they not rent the Church of their faith, times out of mind, by storms and hurricanes of controversy? Every tyro in history knows this. It is an humbling fact. What guarantee have we against its recurrence?

Mr. Stone, then, finding nothing in his appeal to Scripture, nothing in his appeal to primitive antiquity in support of his newly-adopted faith, takes a clear leap to the Nicene and post-Nicene period, viz., to the fourth century, for rest for the soles of his wandering feet. Assuming "that the voice of the fourth century is unmistakably and overwhelmingly on the side of the Roman Church," p. 168, he, strangely enough, adduces the names of the great *Catholic* fathers, in support of *Rome*, not one of whom is a Roman scholar, but every one, except St. Ambrose, belonging to other Patriarchates. Drowning men will surely catch at air! Mr. Stone by a kind of *coup de grâce*, applies in support of the *Roman*, what they have said of the *Catholic Church*. But in reality the burden and the force of their testimony is hostile to the modern pretensions of Rome: yet he says:

"What was the fourth century? It was the golden age of Christianity; it was the age of the conquest of the Roman Empire; the age of the first councils; the palmy age of the great saints and doctors—of Athanasius and Basil, of Gregory Nazianzen and Gregory of Nyssa, of Ambrose and Jerome, of Chrysostom and Augustine." P. 170.

We willingly concede that the fourth century was a very splendid period for the whole Catholic Church, theologically and liturgically considered. While the fourth century was the golden age of systematic theology, it was, also, the muddy age of corruption. It was the age of credulity, false miracles, prayers to the saints, veneration of relics, prayers in an unknown tongue, purgatory, the cultus of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and many like superstitions, which the Church of Rome has developed into dogmas and which she now makes the distinctive features of her system, and which are endorsed by Trentine authority, but which are unsupported by any decisions of the great Catholic Councils. Mr. Stone, with the rest of his confrères, is driven to the fourth century to find the initiative of the Roman Catholic system—having failed to find it either in Scripture or primitive antiquity.

Mr. Stone embarrasses his whole book by a confusion of terms, in his play upon the words "*Catholic*," "*Roman*" Catholic, and "*Catholicism*." His aim, however, is to make the *Roman* Catholic Church, the *Catholic* Church, and so, by an artful transition, attempts to identify Roman Catholicism with Christianity, and then predicates of the old dilemma, "If I was not a Catholic I should be an infidel." "In France, in Spain, in Italy, every man is either a Catholic or an infidel," p. 39. "The alternative, then, really is, submission to the Apostolic See or infidelity," p. 210. We freely concede that the Catholic faith and Christianity are identical; but to admit that *Roman* Catholicism is identical with Christianity, as Mr. Stone assumes, is to admit more than what is true, and what no man can possibly prove. The assertion that [Roman] Catholicism is identical with Christianity is a begging of the whole question at issue.

"If I was not a [Roman] Catholic I should be an infidel," a phrase so often in the mouths of Romanists, is, to say the least, extremely puerile. It is the ultima ratio of despair. It contains the element of, aut Cæsar aut nihil. It is simply the choice of two assumptions. It is the resort of conscious weakness. It is

the same fallacy as that upon which all modern errorists stand, viz., it is the acceptance of the authority of man clothed with the fancied authority of God.

There is a medium between the Roman Catholic dogmas and infidelity, and that medium is the CATHOLIC FAITH proper. The test of the Catholic faith is the following rule,—*semper idem, ubique, de omnibus*. But the Roman Catholic faith will not bear that test, for the Creed of Pope Pius the IV. and the recently defined dogmas of the immaculate conception and papal infallibility are new things in the earth, and were wholly unknown to the ancients; they are nowhere found in Scripture, and have never been received by the Catholic Church; and, but, by the *Roman* Catholic Church only; just in the same way that Wesleyanism is received by the Wesleyans, and Calvinism by the Calvinists. Roman Catholicism is more than the equivalent of Christianity, by all those dogmas, all those liturgical formulas, and all those sacramental outgrowths of mediæval, Tridentine, and Vatican utterances, which were wholly unknown to Christ and His Apostles, to the Apostolic and ante-Nicene fathers, to all the fathers of the truly Catholic Councils, and to the Catholic Church proper; and are known and received as necessary to salvation, by the Roman Church alone, and by her sole authority; but not received by the authority of Christ, His apostles, or the Catholic Church, and never have been received by the Universal Church. In this regard, then, Rome is a sect and guilty of Schism. Let us test this by the following syllogism of the Catholic faith;

Christianity and the Catholic faith are identical,
But the Catholic Church receives the whole Catholic faith,
Therefore the Catholic Church and Christianity are identical.

The Roman Catholic Church.

The Roman Catholic Church and Christianity are not identical;
For the Roman Catholic Church receives doctrines not found in the Christian Scriptures, (for e. g., the Trentine creed, the immaculate conception, the Papal infallibility, etc.).

Therefore Christianity and Roman Catholicism are not identical.

Our author has certainly fallen upon evil times. By his own confession he is one of those precipitate learners who are "ever learning and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth." We would be sorry to question the purity of Mr. Stone's motives or the sincerity of his intentions; but we must say we fail to see

or appreciate his continued lamentations over his mournful ignorance while he remained "*an unmitigated Protestant.*" He deplores his former blindness, his stupidity and folly; the perversion of his education, the obstinacy and virulence of his prejudice, that his mind had been systematically warped, that he was trained to reason from false premises, that he had become the champion of untruth, and all this in such a magniloquent string of truisms as to excite one's pity, or contempt, or both. We illustrate this by the following extract of absurdities.

"I have been led by my own experience to feel that the studies of a young Protestant divine, so far from fitting him to decide with greater promptness and accuracy upon the weighty yet simple proofs by which the Church is identified, have only the effect of deadening his intellectual susceptibility. His mind is systematically warped. He is trained to reason from false premises. He becomes, perhaps by sheer habit, the champion of untruth, and repels with something like angry impulsiveness the notion that he has from the first been defending error, if indeed such a suggestion ever comes at all." P. 207.

The above may be true of those who find their creeds in the teachings of men; whose historic existence dates back only a few years. This may be true, and no doubt is, of the Roman Catholic young divine, who is taught to look for his system in Mediæval and Lateran Councils, in the creed of Pius the IX., and in the dogmas of the Vatican, whose peculiarities can be traced only to the fourth century; but it is impossible to be true of the Anglican student, whose pathway of truth stretches uninterruptedly back through Peter and Paul to our Lord Jesus Christ.

In turning his back on his old friends, our author greatly exults over his wonderful discoveries of truth among his new ones. It seems to us a sort of hallucination for a clergyman of the American Church, especially a man who has held so long the positions that our author has, to pretend, for the first time in his life, to have been so much surprised and delighted at the discoveries he made all of a sudden, in the teachings of Rome! We should like to ask him what he has discovered, that led to his *perversion*, or what he has learned since his joining the Romish Communion, that every well-read and well-trained Anglican clergyman does not know or could not have told him? His extraordinary exultation is not unlike that of a child with a new rattle, or a vain woman with a new dress.

We deny emphatically that the Anglican student is the "*champion of untruth*," or that he needs to be. No, it is the Romanist who is this "*champion*." Having a system to support which has no foundation in Scripture, none in primitive antiquity, none in the great Catholic Creeds, none in the definitions of the first six Ecumenical Councils; what has he to rely on, but "*false decretals*," sophistical arguments, constructive logic, special pleading, broad platitudes, fine writing and magniloquent oratory, Papal assumptions, Papal bulls, and Papal decretals? The position of papal abettors we have, of late years more especially, regarded as one of petulant, unreasoning, dogged determination and persistent defence of certain dogmatical assumptions, simply because they are the utterances of Rome and for *no other* reason, and this seems to us to be the self-chosen position of Mr. Stone.

What discoveries soever Mr. Stone may have made in his way to Rome, he has certainly not put the results into his book, which we have read with some care; but fail to see anything more than the thread-bare and stale rehash of old Roman terms and special pleadings, that have been answered a thousand times by various pens, and which we remember to have known as long as we have known the Roman controversy itself; except that we may apply the old adage, that, what in the book is new is not true, and what is true is not new. There are points in the work, however, worth answering, and we think it would be a very easy literary exercise, for some young divine to reply to the "*Invitation Heeded*," in which there is little or nothing to heed.

ART. VIII.—MICHAEL FARADAY.

The Life and Letters of Faraday. BY DR. BENCE JONES, *Secretary of the Royal Institution.* In two volumes. Pp. 427, 499, 8vo. Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1870.

Faraday as a Discoverer. BY JOHN TYNDALL. 12mo, pp. viii. 171. New York. D. Appleton & Co. 1868.

Article, Faraday. *Edinburgh Review*, July, 1870.

Articles by John Tyndall on Faraday. *The Academy.* Vol. I. Nos. 8 and 9, 1870.

MATERIALS have now been quite freely supplied, such as they are, for a life of Faraday, but there is yet to come such a portrait of the man, and such a sketch of his labors as a discoverer, that the man may stand forth as a living worker for our time. If Dr. Tyndall could have written his life, he would have conferred a debt of gratitude upon both the literary and scientific world. His monograph on Faraday as a Discoverer has great value, and gives the only brief and clear sketch there is of the great philosopher's work. The Article in the *Edinburgh Review* was written by one who knew Faraday well, and is to be considered as a contribution to his biography. The editing of his *Life and Letters*, by Dr. Bence Jones, which we ought to be grateful for in the absence of something better, has not been skillfully done, and is rather a mass of materials than a well-digested biography. However, let us be grateful for what we have, and remember *Non omnia possumus omnes*. Dr. Jones' work has been done with simplicity, if not with ability, and he lets Faraday tell his own story, often with exceeding freshness and spirit. We shall now make free use of the sources of information named at the head of this Article. I shall attempt, in brief space, to give some popular account of the Man, Faraday, and the kind of work which God gave him to do.

More than usually falls to the lot of literary men, the life of an experimental philosopher, like that of a solitary thinker, is apart and alone, and demands that concentration of energy which withdraws the man himself within a narrow circle of activity. We buy at this price that high and clear vision of single things which gives eminence in science and philosophy. The lives of leading men seem limited to a very narrow range, but within that range they have that supremacy of power and influence which makes them, to a certain extent, kings in the realm of human thought. Such a man was Michael Faraday, who rose from the humblest ranks, through the sheer force of genius and close application to his profession, to be the greatest experimental philosopher of the age. It is interesting to trace the steps by which the word Faraday, from meaning nothing to other men, came to be the name which kings, and princes, and educated men everywhere delighted to honor,—a plain name, indeed, when most honored, but powerful still more through that very plainness and simplicity.

He was born at Newington, in Surrey, England, September 22d, 1791. His father was a journeyman blacksmith. His mother had no education, and was not able to enter at all into her son's pursuits, but she was so proud of "my Michael," as she used to call him, that Faraday often asked his wife not to speak to her about him or his honors, saying she was quite proud enough of him, and it would not be good for her. Up to twelve years of age, he says, "my education was of the most ordinary description, consisting of little more than the rudiments of reading, writing, and arithmetic at a common day-school. My hours out of school were passed at home and in the streets." In his thirteenth year he became errand boy to a bookseller, and used to carry round the papers which were lent out by his master. In after life he rarely saw a newsboy without saying, "I always feel a tenderness for those boys, because I once carried newspapers myself." When fourteen years old he was bound out for seven years as a book-binder to Mr. Riebau. Here his scientific education began. Watts "On the Mind," first made him think, and his attention was first specially turned, he writes, to science by "the Encyclopædia Britannica, from which I gained my first notions of electricity, and Mrs. Marcet's Conversations on Chemistry, which gave me my foundation in that science. Do not suppose that I was a very deep thinker, or was marked as a precocious person. I was a very lively, imaginative person, and could believe in the Arabian Knights as easily as in the Encyclopædia, but facts were important to me, and saved me. I could trust a fact, and always cross-examined an assertion. So, when I questioned Mrs. Marcet's book by such little experiments as I could find means to perform, and found it true to the facts as I could understand them, I felt that I had got hold of an anchor in Chemical knowledge, and clung fast to it." He thus began his philosophical studies in the hours after the day's work was done with the books placed in his hands to bind, and indulged himself in such simple experiments in chemistry and philosophy as could be defrayed in their expense by a few pence per week. He first constructed an electrical machine with a glass phial, and afterwards with a real cylinder, and made other similar electrical apparatus. Then he was attracted to some lectures on Natural Philosophy by the bills in the streets and shop-windows near his house, his brother furnishing

the shilling which admitted him. He learned perspective, that he might illustrate these lectures. He kept a note-book of events relating to the arts and sciences, thus picking up, with constant diligence, the education which was soon to be turned to practical account.

A young man, near twenty-one years of age, and just through with the learning of the book-binder's trade, he was fortunate enough to hear four of the concluding lectures in a course given by Sir Humphrey Davy at the Royal Institution. They aroused the desire to be engaged in scientific occupations, even though of the lowest kind. This longing soon took definite shape.

"My desire to escape from trade, which I thought vicious and selfish, and to enter into the service of science, which I imagined made its pursuers amiable and liberal, induced me at last to take the bold and simple step of writing to Sir Humphrey Davy, expressing my wishes, and a hope that if an opportunity came in his way he would favor my views; at the same time, I sent the notes I had taken of his lectures. It is said that Sir Humphrey, on receiving the note, exclaimed to his friend, Mr. Pepys, who happened to be present; "Pepys, what am I to do? Here is a letter from a young man named Faraday; he has been attending my lectures, and wants me to give him employment at the Royal Institution,—*what can I do?*" "*Do?*" replied Pepys, "put him to wash bottles; if he is good for anything he will do it directly; if he refuses, he is good for nothing." "No, no," replied Davy; "we must try him with something better than that."

This was early in 1813. It led to an interview, and one night when Faraday was undressing at his humble London lodgings, he was startled by a loud knock at the door, and on looking out he saw a carriage from which the footman had alighted and left a note for him. It was a request from Sir Humphrey Davy to become the assistant in the laboratory of the Royal Institution, with a salary of 25s. a week, and two rooms at the top of the house. Davy said of him to the managers, "His habits seem good, his disposition active and cheerful, and his manner intelligent."

His active scientific education was begun. Some record of the life, thoughts and feelings of Faraday is preserved at this time in a series of letters written by him to a young man of his own age by the name of Abbott. They are so remarkable for the energy, correctness and fluency of their style, that it is difficult to believe that they were written by one who had only the rudiments of an education. They were an important help to him in self-improvement, and some passages soon to be quoted to show how

he mapped out unconsciously his future course, will indicate their tone and strength. Another aid to Faraday was the City Philosophical Society, founded in 1808, consisting of thirty or forty individuals, perhaps all in the humble or moderate rank of life. They met every Wednesday evening for mutual instruction, having sometimes debates and at other times lectures delivered by members. Within this society some half-a-dozen members used to meet of an evening to read together, and to criticise, correct and improve each other's pronunciation and construction of language. The discipline was very steady, the remarks very plain and open, and the results most valuable. For several years they met on Saturday evenings in the loft of the Royal Institution, then Faraday's place of residence. In this society he began, within two years and a half of his becoming a member, a course of lectures on chemistry, a work which he carried on for forty-eight years at the Royal Institution. His first work as chemical assistant to Davy, was to extract sugar from beet-root, and here he began those careful and accurate experiments for which he was so celebrated.

His remarks to Abbott upon the conditions of success for lecturers on science so fully outline his own subsequent practice, that they must be quoted in part :

"The most prominent requisite to a lecturer, though not really the most important, is a good delivery; for though to all true philosophers, science and nature will have charms innumerable in every dress, yet I am sorry that the generality of mankind cannot accompany us one short hour unless the path is strewn with flowers. In order, therefore, to gain the attention of an audience, (and what can be more disagreeable to a lecturer than the want of it?) it is necessary to pay some attention to the manner of expression. The utterance should not be rapid and hurried, and consequently unintelligible, but slow and deliberate, conveying ideas with ease from the lecturer, and infusing them with clearness and readiness into the minds of the audience. A lecturer should endeavor by all means to obtain a facility of utterance and the power of clothing his thoughts and ideas in language smooth and harmonious, and at the same time simple and easy. His periods should be round, not too long or unequal; they should be complete and expressive, conveying clearly the whole of the ideas intended to be conveyed. If they are long, obscure, or incomplete, they give rise to a degree of labor in the minds of the hearers, which quickly causes lassitude, indifference, and end in disgust."

"A lecturer should appear easy and collected, undaunted and unconcerned, his thoughts about him, and his mind clear and free for the contemplation and description of his subject. His action should not be hasty

or violent, but slow, easy, and natural, consisting principally in changes of the posture of the body, in order to avoid the air of stiffness and sameness that would otherwise be unavoidable. His whole behaviour should evince respect for his audience, and he should in no case forget that he is in their presence. No accident that does not interfere with their convenience should disturb his serenity or cause variation in his behaviour; he should never if possible turn his back on them, but should give them full reason to believe that all his powers have been exerted for their pleasure and instruction."

"Although I allow a lecturer to write out his matter, I do not approve of his reading it, at least not as he would a quotation or extract. He should deliver it in a ready and free manner, referring to his book merely as he would to copious notes, and not confining his tongue to the exact path there delineated, but digress as circumstances may demand or localities may allow."

"No breaks or digressions foreign to the purpose should have a place in the circumstances of the evening; no opportunity should be allowed to the audience in which their minds could wander from the subject or return to inattention and carelessness. A flame should be lighted at the commencement and kept alive with unremitting splendor to the end. For this reason I very much disapprove of breaks in a lecture, and where they can by any means be avoided, they should on no account find place." "Digressions and wanderings produce more or less the bad effects of a complete break or delay in a lecture, and should therefore never be allowed except in very peculiar circumstances; they take the audience from the main subject, and you then have the labor of bringing them back again (if possible). For the same reason (namely, that the audience should not grow tired), I disapprove of long lectures; one hour is long enough for any one, nor should they be allowed to exceed that time."

"An experimental lecturer should attend very carefully to the choice he may make of experiments for the illustration of his subject. They should be important as they respect the science they are applied to, yet clear, and such as may easily and generally be understood. They should rather approach to simplicity and explain the established principles of the subject than be elaborate and apply to minute phenomena only. I speak here (be it understood) of those lectures which are delivered before a mixed audience, and the nature of which will not admit of their being applied to the explanation of any but the principal parts of a science. If to a particular audience you dwell on a particular subject, still adhere to the same principle, though perhaps not exactly to the same rule. Let your experiments apply to the subject you elucidate; do not introduce those which are not to the point."

Such were the mature ideas which a young man just turned twenty-one put forth in regard to the work which he himself was so ardently looking forward to. His conception of the true philosopher, uttered in one of his lectures before the Philosophical

Society, is not less clear, comprehensive and to the point—The philosopher should be a man willing to listen to every suggestion, but determined to judge for himself. He should not be biased by appearances; have no favorite hypothesis; be of no school; and in doctrine have no master. He should not be a respecter of persons but of things. Truth should be his primary object. If to these qualities be added industry, he may indeed hope to walk within the veil of the temple of nature.

The following rules were found among his notes :—

“Never to repeat a phrase.

“Never to go back to amend.

“If at a loss for a word, not to ch-ch-ch or eh-eh-eh, but to stop and wait for it. It soon comes, and the bad habits are broken, and fluency soon acquired.

“Never to doubt a correction given to me by another.”

Even when giving the private lectures on chemistry before the City Philosophical Society, he showed his strong determination to execute everything he undertook in the best manner, by entering himself at the same time an evening class of lectures by Prof. Smart on Elocution. In 1823, before appearing as a public lecturer, he took private lessons of the same teacher at half a guinea each, and again he took further lessons in 1827, and afterwards Prof. Smart used to attend Faraday's lectures himself, to criticise his address and delivery. Another friend used to come regularly to his morning lectures for the sole purpose of noting down for him any faults of delivery or defective pronunciation that could be detected. In early days he always lectured with a card before him with *Slow* written upon it in distinct characters. Sometimes he would overlook it and become too rapid, when his assistant had orders to place the card before him. Sometimes he had the word *Time* on a card brought forward when the hour was nearly expired. So careful was he to carry out himself the conditions of success in lecturing. Nor was he less attentive to the subject-matter of his discourses. “In the earlier days of the juvenile lectures,” says his niece, “he used to encourage me to tell him everything that struck me, and where my difficulties lay when I did not understand him fully. In the next lecture he would enlarge on those especial points, and he would tell me my remarks had helped him to make things clear to the young ones.” In arranging for

his experiments, he always tried the stopper of every bottle he was to use before the lecture began, so that no delay might be caused from the stopper being fixed, when the reagent was wanted during the lecture. His notes were prepared with excessive care and neatness, and some statements of familiar truths in his hands became suggestive of new meanings.

It is time, however, to go back to the young man, who had now become chemical assistant to the great Davy in the Royal Institution. He did not have to wash bottles, but became his confidential companion and friend, a position which was abundantly tested during a European tour with Sir Humphrey through France, Italy, Switzerland, the Tyrol, Geneva, and the region of the Rhine, from Oct. 13th, 1813, to April 23d, 1815. Lady Davy accompanied them, and was the cause of much annoyance to Faraday, by making him a servant, and refusing to allow him to eat at the same table with herself and husband. This reached to a point of offence hardly to be endured, when he was frequently made to feel the effects of Lady Davy's ungovernable temper, and he often was on the point of turning homeward, yet this tour with Davy was in some sense of great benefit to Faraday. It brought him into a practical acquaintance with the state of science on the continent. He met the leading men in philosophy and science; and his keen eye and judgment reaped a quiet harvest in observation and experience for future work. Indeed, his seven years under Davy before he came in charge of the laboratory of the Royal Institution, and began the wonderful series of researches which have made him famous, were years of the best training then possible to a young philosopher. He has himself said:—

"What we call accident, has in my life had much to do with the matter [of learning science], for I had to work and prepare for others before I had earned the privilege of working for myself; and I have no doubt that was my great instruction and introduction into physical science." Faraday said on coming home: "I have learned just enough to perceive my ignorance; the little knowledge I have gained makes me wish to know more."

His indebtedness to Davy he was ever ready to acknowledge, and no one more earnestly praised his scientific work, yet with all his genius Davy was hurt by his own great success; he had very little self-control and but very little method and order; and when Faraday was to be elected a member of the Royal Society, he

walked for an hour round the court-yard of Somerset House, arguing that Faraday ought not to be elected: and the pupil was known to say that the greatest of all his great advantages was that he had a model to teach him what he should avoid. Yet Faraday in 1819 was the recipient of words from Davy, which show that the patron had then overcome all selfish feeling and wished him well.

"It gives me great pleasure to hear that you are comfortable at the Royal Institution, and I trust that you will not only do something good and honorable for yourself, but also for your science."

During this time his days were of course employed in the laboratory, but "with reference to my evenings they are thus engaged:—On Monday evening there is a scientific meeting of members here, and every other Monday a dinner, to both of which my company is requisite. On Tuesday evening I have a pupil, who comes at six o'clock and stops till nine, engaged in private lessons. On Wednesday the Society requires my aid. Thursday is my only evening for accidental engagements. Friday, my pupil returns and stops his three hours; and on Saturday I have to arrange my little private business."

The spectacle of a philosopher in love is a little peculiar. Faraday had written in his common-place book against love, and was not known to have any tender feelings in that direction; yet in 1820 he wrote to Miss Sarah Barnard, the daughter of an elder in the Sandemanian Church, who had seen these passages, and knew how averse he was to matrimony: "You have converted me from one erroneous way; let me hope you will attempt to convert what others are wrong:" with much more in the way of tender entreaty. Miss Barnard showed the letter to her father, who said that love made philosophers into fools. Her youth (she was ten years his junior) and her fears made her hesitate to accept Faraday, and she escaped from London to postpone any decision. Faraday left too in hot pursuit, and did not return again to the routine of life and business till the fair one was captured. All obstacles being removed, they were married on the twelfth of June, 1821, Faraday desiring that the day should be just like any other day, and so offending some of his near relations by not asking them to the wedding. The lady made him a happy man for forty-seven years, and twenty-eight years after the marriage, Faraday said, "the union has nowise changed except in the depth and strength of its character." He took his wife home with him

to the Institution, having already been appointed the superintendent of the house and laboratory. Among the records and events of his life he speaks, in 1847, of his marriage as "one which," as a source of honor and happiness, far exceeds all the rest; and Dr. Tyndall adds: "In all his relations to his wife he added *chivalry* to affection." They lived constantly together, and whenever business called him from home for even two or three days, letters full of gushing sentiment were said to come from the great philosopher. His married life was indeed one constant romance of tender and holy love.

Soon after his marriage he united with the Sandemanian Church, of which in 1840 he became an elder. He did this without consulting his wife, and in reply to her subsequent questioning he said of his decision, "That is between me and my God." When he entered the meeting-house he used to leave his science behind him, and would listen to the prayer and exhortation of the most illiterate brother with an attention which showed how he loved the word of truth, from whomsoever it came. "His religion was by no means a harsh form of Calvinism, but a simple, child-like faith, rather evincing itself in the deep humility which ran through his life." When he was fifty-three he wrote—

"There is no philosophy in my religion. I am of a very small and despised sect of Christians, known, if known at all, as *Sandemanians*, and our hope is founded on the faith that is in Christ. But though the natural works of God can never by any possibility come in contradiction with the higher things that belong to our future existence, and must with everything concerning Him ever glorify Him, still I do not think it at all necessary to tie the study of the natural sciences and religion together, and in my intercourse with my fellow-creatures, that which is religious and that which is philosophical have ever been two distinct things." "He refused to bring to bear upon the highest things those mental operations which he delighted to apply to very high things. In religion he neither investigated nor reasoned. He inherited the peculiar and simple High Calvinism of the followers of Glass and Sandeman, and he kept his faith to the end. His sect was founded by two Scotch Presbyterians [1728], early in the last century. He preached as the elder of his small church. The present writer* found out the dull and ugly Sandemanian meeting-house, in a court behind the Barbican, and heard the brilliant and philosophical lecturer preach. He complained (this was fifteen years after his first election as an elder) that his memory was failing; he spoke earnestly and quietly, but without a tittle of that real power with which he two days before had lectured on science. Texts were

* London Spectator, 1870.

strung together, but they often had little or no connection; while the doctrines which were enunciated were backed by quotations not always correctly given or thoroughly understood. The discourse was in fact pious but unintelligent. The whole service was in fact very wearisome, and the attention of the small congregation languid in the extreme. Yet, however curious and unintelligent his form of faith and his convictions as to its origin and place may seem, Faraday did, after all, carry his religion into his daily life, and even though unconsciously, into his philosophy. He was honest, manly, noble; full of tender kindness and care; he pressed every power of his intellect into the service of the God of nature and of man, and it is rightly said of him that not half his greatness was incorporate with his science, for science could not reveal the bravery and delicacy of his heart."

He was now engaged in what has been called his higher scientific education. He was a most frequent contributor, and part of the time the editor of the *Quarterly Journal of Science*, and he was gaining daily in reputation as a chemist and man of general science. He had opened a correspondence with the late Prof. G. De La Rive, of Geneva, the man who had so kindly encouraged him while the youthful companion of Davy on the continent, and whose experiments on Sounding Flames, Faraday with modest self-trust had already corrected. He had begun in 1827 a course of Juvenile Lectures on Chemistry, which he conducted with remarkable success for nine years. He had declined in the same year the Professorship of Chemistry in the London University, and in 1829 had become lecturer at the Royal Academy, Woolwich. From the assistant in the Laboratory of the Royal Institution, he had become its director. He had constantly lectured in the great theatre, and he had probably saved the Institution by taking the most active part in the establishment of the Friday evening meetings. He had made two leading discoveries, the one on electro-magnetic motions, the other on condensation of several gases into liquids. He had carried out two important and most laborious on the alloy of steel, and on the manufacture of optical glass. He had discovered two new chlorides of carbon; among the products of the decomposition of oil by heat he had found the bicarburet of hydrogen, or benzol; he had determined the combination of sulphuric acid and naphthaline, and the formation of a new body, sulpho-naphthalic acid; and he had made the first experiments on the diffusion of gases, a subject which has become, by the researches of Professor Graham, of the utmost importance. He had had sixty important scientific papers printed, and nine of these had

been honored with a place in the Philosophical Transactions of the Institution. Had his life of research ended even here it might well have been called a noble success.

The Friday evening lectures, just alluded to as saving the existence of the Royal Institution, became very popular. The writer in the *Edinburgh Review* gives a very graphic description of the enthusiasm they awakened:

"To attend these lectures became the fashionable rage—the rush up the Institution stairs was only to be compared to the old rush on a Jenny Lind night. Then there really was something worth seeing and hearing, even for those who did not pretend to scientific tastes. There was something so taking, so generally kind, so affectionate in his manner toward his audience, his devotion to his subject so shone in every word and action, whilst his perfect simplicity only heightened the effect of his natural eloquence, that people came to see and hear him not so much for the sake of his science as for the sake of the man. It must not be supposed, however, that men of science themselves did not benefit from his lectures. No one before or since Faraday has been able to lecture as he did. The clearness of his statements, the orderly arrangement of his matter, was so perfect that when lecturing on some new and difficult point of experiment or theory, the merest tyro came away with the idea that he understood the whole bearings of the subject, whilst the men of science, who next to the lecturer knew, perhaps, most about the question, always found material for thought, and not unfrequently incentives to renewed exertion. Then Faraday's manner in lecturing was perfectly natural; everything went so smoothly, his experiments were so convincing and always so successful, that one might be apt to think that all this was the result of a happy intuitive power. Those who knew Faraday can tell, however, by what patient labor these results were brought about—how he used to spend hours upon hours arranging his experiments so as to ensure success—how no detail was too minute to escape his attention, and how well he had thought over the best mode of presenting his subject."

The next twenty-five years dating from 1830, was the period of Faraday's great work. Giddiness and loss of memory brought on by overdoing compelled him to desist for four years, but aside from this his whole energies were given to his researches as, in Dr. Tyndall's words, "the greatest experimental philosopher the world has ever seen." Into the progressive steps by which his discoveries were made, involving as they do considerable scientific definition we cannot now enter, but the methods which led to his discoveries are of deepest interest to all. He said in 1860:

"I was never able to make a fact my own without seeing it; and the description of the best works altogether failed to convey to my mind such a knowledge of things as to allow myself to form a judgment upon them. It was so with *new* things. If Grove, or Wheatstone, or Gassiot, or any other told me a new fact, and wanted my opinion, either of its value, or the cause or the evidence it could give on any subject, I never could say anything until I had seen the fact. . . . All my work had to be my own."

He used to say that it required twenty years of such work in becoming acquainted with facts to make a *man* in Physical Science. He always had some great object of research in view, but in its pursuit he frequently alighted on facts of collateral interest, to examine which he sometimes turned aside from his direct course. To him the main value of a fact was its position and suggestiveness in the general sequence of scientific truth, and having established the existence of a phenomenon, his habit was to look at it from all possible points of view, and to develop its relationship to other phenomena. When an experimental result was obtained, it was instantly enlarged by his imagination.

"I am acquainted," says Dr. Tyndall, "with no mind whose power and suddenness of expansion at the touch of new physical truth could be ranked with his. Sometimes I have compared the action of his experiments upon his mind to that of highly combustible matter thrown into a furnace; every fresh entry of fact was accompanied by the immediate development of light and heat. The light, which was intellectual, enabled him to see far beyond the boundaries of the fact itself, and the heat, which was emotional, urged him to the conquest of this newly revealed domain. But though the force of his imagination was enormous, he bridled it like a mighty rider, and never permitted his intellect to be overthrown. In virtue of the expansive power which his vivid imagination conferred upon him, he rose from the smallest beginnings to the grandest ends."

His researches assumed at times a speculative character such that it was difficult to follow him.

"In his speculations he mixes together light and darkness in varying proportions, and carries us along with him through strong alternations of both. . . . Still across them flash frequent gleams of prescient wisdom which will excite admiration through all time, while the facts, relations, principles and laws, which his experiments have established are sure to form the body of grand theories yet to come."

On August 29th, 1831, Faraday began his electrical researches. In ten days of experiment that Fall when the October leaves were brightening with autumnal tints, he made the discovery of Magne-

to-electricity. On the 5th of December following he was again continuing his experiments in evolving electricity from terrestrial magnetism. He next made experiments on Electro-chemical decomposition. In 1834 he gives his first utterance on the correlation of physical forces, subsequently so well set forth by Mr. Grove in 1842. In 1833, he was appointed Professor of Chemistry at the Royal Institution with a salary of one hundred pounds a year. In 1835 he at first refused, because Lord Melbourne had been guilty of an ungentlemanly epithet, but afterwards was prevailed upon to receive, at the king's special request, a pension for his distinguished services as a discoverer. He was invited in 1841 to lecture in America with a remuneration of £450, but was obliged to decline. In 1843 the present ex-Emperor Napoleon, then a prisoner at the Fort of Ham, wrote to inquire the most simple combination to give to a voltaic battery in order to produce a spark capable of setting fire to powder under water or under ground. In 1845 he began the experiments which soon resulted in the discovery of the magnetization of light, the magnetic state of all matter, and finally of atmospheric magnetism. While in the early flush of approaching success, he wrote to Sir John Herschel, who replied :

"Go on and prosper—from strength to strength, like a victor marching with assured step to further conquests, and be assured that no voice will join more heartily in the peans that already begin to rise, and will speedily swell into a shout of triumph astounding even to yourself, than that of yours most truly, J. F. W. Herschel."

In 1853, when table-turning was rampant, he made a few simple experiments, which showed that such operations were not beyond the domain of physical science, and in thinking how hard it is for man to avoid error in his interpretations of fact he exclaims in a letter to a friend:—

"I declare that, taking the average of many minds that have recently come before me (and apart from that spirit which God has placed in each), and accepting for a moment that average as a standard, I should far prefer the obedience, affections, and instincts of a dog before it. Do not whisper this, nowever, to others. There is One above who worketh in all things, and who governs even in the midst of that misrule to which the tendencies and powers of men are so easily perverted."

The year 1855 closed the series of experimental researches in Electricity, which Dr. Tyndall has thus summed up in his own masterly way:—

"When from an Alpine height the eye of the climber ranges over the mountains, he finds that for the most part they resolve themselves into distinct groups, each consisting of a dominant mass surrounded by peaks of lesser elevation. The power which lifted the mightier eminencies, in nearly all cases lifted others to an almost equal height. And so it is with the discoveries of Faraday. As a general rule, the dominant result does not stand alone, but forms the culminating point of a vast and varied mass of inquiry. In this way round about his great discovery of magneto-electric induction, other weighty labors group themselves. His investigations on the extra current; on the Polar and other conditions of Diamagnetic Bodies; on Lines of Magnetic Force; their definite character and distribution; on the employment of the Induced Magneto-Electric Current as a measure and test of Magnetic Action; on the Revulsive Phenomena of the Magnetic field, are all, notwithstanding the diversity of title, researches in the domain of Magneto-Electric Induction.

"Faraday's second group of researches and discoveries embraces the chemical phenomena of the current; the dominant result here is the great law of Electro-chemical Decomposition, around which are massed various researches on Electro-chemical Conduction, and on Electrolysis, both with the machine and with the Pile. In this group, also, belong his analysis of the Contact Theory, his inquiries as to the source of Voltaic Electricity, and his final development of the Chemical Theory of the Pile.

"His third great discovery is the Magnetization of Light, which I should liken to the Weisshorn among mountains,—high, beautiful, and alone.

"The dominant result of his fourth group of researches is the discovery of Diamagnetism, announced in his memoir as the magnetic condition of all matter, round which are grouped his inquiries on the Magnetism of Flame and Gases; on Magne-crystallic Action, and on Atmospheric Magnetism, in its relations to the annual and diurnal variation of the needle, the full significance of which is still to be shown.

"These are Faraday's most massive discoveries, and upon them his fame must chiefly rest. But even without them, sufficient would remain to secure for him a high and lasting scientific reputation. We should still have his researches on the Liquefaction of Gases; on Frictional Electricity; on the Electricity of the Gymnotus; on the source of Power in the Hydro-Electric machine; on Electro-magnetic Rotations; on Regelation; all his more purely Chemical Researches, including his discovery of Benzol. Besides these he published a multitude of minor papers, most of which in some way or other illustrate his genius. I have made no allusion to his power and sweetness as a lecturer. Taking him for all and all, I think it will be conceded that Michael Faraday was the greatest experimental philosopher the world has ever seen. And I will add the opinion, that the progress of future research will tend, not to dim or to diminish, but to enhance and glorify the labors of this mighty investigator."

Ninety-five societies made him an honorary or corresponding member during his lifetime, all, excepting the title of F. R. S.,

which was sought and paid for, being the spontaneous offerings of kindness and good will from the bodies named. Respecting these he said, "I cannot say I have not valued such distinctions; on the contrary I esteem them very highly, but I do not think I have ever worked for or sought them." He had among his correspondents and intimate friends all the leading scientific minds of his age, including Arago, Humboldt, Agassiz, and Liebig. His own sovereign bestowed upon him a house at Hampton Court where his closing years were spent, and where he died on the 25th of August, 1867, at the age of seventy-five.

This man had a brave heart. In 1832 when his income from employment as a chemist might have been £5000 a year, and when in an average lifetime he might have accumulated some £150,000, he voluntarily chose to remain a poor philosopher that he might give himself entirely to experimental science. His professional income went down to nothing. He lived an essentially private life, with the strictest economy, never dining out lest he should lose time, taking not the slightest interest in politics, but giving himself with undivided attention to physical research. It is an example of singleness of purpose well worthy of imitation. Home and Science were the life of Faraday.

And yet even in the line of practical usefulness, what Faraday did has an important bearing upon the age. His was not merely speculative research. Says Dr. Tyndall:

"As far as electricity has been applied for medical purposes, it has been almost exclusively Faraday's electricity. You have noticed those lines of wire [the electric telegraph] which cross the streets of London. It is Faraday's currents that speed from place to place through these wires. Approaching the point of Dungeness, the mariner sees an unusually brilliant light, and from the noble *phares* of La Heve the same light flashes across the sea. These are Faraday's sparks, exalted by suitable machinery to sunlike splendor."

The close of Faraday's life was like the beautiful sunsets which he always loved to watch. Often while pursuing his researches with unremitting ardor, Mrs. Faraday would take him away to Brighton, and once he was obliged to travel several months in Switzerland in order to recuperate his energies. He was a passionate lover of outward nature, and some of his descriptions of waterfalls and thunderstorms and sunsets have the tender beauty

and glow of the poet. Such, for instance, is the following picture of a rainbow at the bottom of a fine but furious cataract, where the sun shone brightly upon the mist. There it remained motionless whilst the gusts and clouds of spray swept furiously across its place and were dashed against the rock. It looked like a spirit strong in faith and steadfast in the midst of the storm of passions sweeping across it, and though it might fade and revive, still held on to the rock as in hope and giving hope, and the very drops which in the whirlwind of their fury seemed as if they would carry all away were made to revive it and give it greater beauty; and this is his moral lesson. "How often are the things we fear and esteem as troubles made to become blessings to those who are led to receive them with humility and patience!" He took great pleasure in Byron's description of a storm on Lake Leman, and Coleridge's Hymn to Mont Blanc delighted him. Storms excited his admiration at all times, and he was never tired of looking into the heavens. Mountain scenery kindled his imagination.

"Mont Blanc," said he, "is wonderful, and I could not but feel at it what I have often felt before, that painting is far beneath poetry in cases of high expression, of which this is one. No artist should try to paint Mont Blanc; it is utterly out of his reach. He cannot convey an idea of it, and a formal mass or a commonplace model conveys more intelligence, even with respect to the sublimity of the mountains, than his highest efforts can do. In fact, he must be able to dip his brush in light and darkness before he can paint Mont Blanc. Yet the moment one sees it, Lord Byron's expressions come to mind as they seem to apply. The poetry and the subject dignify each other." Again he says, while resting away from London, "A glorious sunset brings with it a thousand thoughts that delight me." Very touching is the following picture by one who knew him best. "I shall never look at the lightning flashes without recalling his delight in a beautiful storm, how he would stand at the window for hours watching the effects and enjoying the scene, while we knew his mind was full of lofty thoughts, sometimes of the great Creator and sometimes of the laws by which He sees meet to govern the earth. I shall also always connect the sight of the hues of a brilliant sunset with him, and especially will he be present to my mind while I watch the fading of the tints into the sombre gray of night. He loved to have us with him, as he stood or sauntered on some open spot, and spoke his thoughts perhaps in the words of Gray's Elegy, which he retained in memory long after many other things had faded quite away. Then, as darkness stole on, his companions would gradually turn indoors, while he was well pleased to be left to the solitary communing with his own thoughts."

There was another side to his life, and one quite in keeping with the simplicity of his character. He had little time for reading outside of the books of science, the journals, the *Times* and the *Athenæum*. He always read the Scriptures. When thoroughly tired and exhausted he would turn to some story or novel and find it a great rest, but he did not take to biography or travels. Sometimes he used to read to his family out of Shakspeare or Byron, and later out of Macaulay. He liked the opera and enjoyed the theatre when he could take Mrs. Faraday with him. He never missed the wonderful sights of the day—acrobats and tumblers, giants and dwarfs, and he would laugh till tears ran down his cheeks at the tricks of monkeys in the Zoological Gardens. Even Punch and Judy was an unfailing source of delight whether he looked at the performance or the admiring, gaping crowd.

Yet the leading purpose of Faraday was never forgotten. More or less, he was never, even in times of failing health, without some original investigation. This activity was not diminished when in his seventieth year he wrote, "Nothing would make me happier in the things of this life than to make some scientific discovery or development." There was no part of his life that gave him more delight than his connection with Trinity House as scientific adviser, in matters affecting the commerce of nations, and his highest reward as a scientific man was given in his own report to that House that his own grandest discovery could be made useful for the preservation of the lives of seamen.

Thus the old philosopher, the man who was so in love with science that he could not afford to be rich, who could hardly spare the time from his work to have a Royal Academician paint his portrait, lived on to the end. Humble and contented, he often spoke of himself as "just waiting," and thus with patient heart, and with a mind at rest, as a summer afternoon, peacefully and quietly he died in his chair, in his study, and the spirit of a great and good man returned to God who gave it. His funeral was attended only by a few relations and friends, and the silent service at the grave was only the shedding of tears by those who knew and loved him best.

A strong, brave thinker, a hungering searcher for facts, a humble, patient, brave man, the conqueror of a fiery and excitable temper till it gave a strong and steady glow of sweetness and love,

a kind and pure-hearted man, a lover of truth and sincerity, humble in his very greatness, Faraday, as an experimental philosopher and as a Christian gentleman, was a man of genius, winning his way from the humblest position, and has left a name which the world will not willingly let die.

ART. IX.—UNITY IN OUR NEXT GENERAL CONVENTION.

The Church Book Society. Thirteenth Annual Report. Depository, New York, 1865.

Proceedings of the Board of Managers of the Protestant Episcopal Society for the promotion of Evangelical Knowledge, at the twenty-third annual meeting. No. 3, Bible House, New York.

The Evangelical Educational Society. Fourth Annual Report. No. 2 Bible House, New York, 1870.

The Society for the Increase of the Ministry. The Fourteenth Annual Report. Church Press Co., Hartford, 1870.

American Church Missionary Society. Eleventh Annual Report. No. 3 Bible House, New York, 1870.

Reports of the Committees of the Board of Missions of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Nos. 17 & 19 Bible House, New York, 1870.

The Report of the Proceedings of the Board of Trustees of the General Theological Seminary. New York, 1870.

The Report of the Russo-Greek Committee. Journal of the General Convention, 1868.

Italian Reform Movement. Report of Committee to the General Convention, 1868.

It is impossible to comprehend the genius and mission of the English and American churches without studying their peculiar relation to Christendom. Perhaps one reason why they are so generally misunderstood is found in the fact that they are regarded only in the present, and not in the future. The triumphs of our Holy Religion are not to be disconnected from the Greek and Latin Communions. These spread themselves over vast territories.

These number their hundreds of millions. These are venerable in their history, marvellous in their influence, gigantic in their organization. On the contrary how powerful that section of Protestantism rejecting an Episcopal order! How it has diffused itself over the earth! How numerous its adherents! How great its learning! How multiplied its agencies! How respectable its literature! How its societies, and colleges, and publications, and pulpits lead and guide the development of the age, and country! Now between that mediæval Catholicism which has retained the order of the Church but corrupted its Faith, and that modern Protestantism which inculcates its Faith, but repudiates its order, the only Providential link of connection is that wise Anglicanism which has preserved both the Order and the Faith. God, through the Saxon race, has spread it over the world. It is everywhere an olive branch. It would unite in the Cross vast Communion otherwise hopelessly divided. It would bring into millennial fellowship our universal Christendom, whose consciousness, and whose worship throughout our globe may yet find expression in the language of our venerable Prayer-Book.

While this is our heritage and our mission we cannot now triumph in the prospect. The glow of victory is reserved for a future generation. Our emblem now is the cross rather than the crown. In England and America the ambassadors of unity are themselves distracted by divisions.

Without glancing over the ocean, the state of our own Church is sufficiently humiliating and embarrassing. We are distracted by antagonisms of opinion, numerous and hostile. 1. There is a Roman element which has recently escaped from its disguise in a form so bold and flagrant that it cannot be mistaken. If the poison is confined in its operations it is yet most active and venomous. It can be analyzed, and studied in an address issued by their Rector to the Communicants of the St. Sacrament Mission in the city of New York, during the past year. This circular uses the following daring language.

“With reference to the celebration of the Holy Communion in the oratory, the first celebration will always be offered in Reparation of the insults our Lord receives in the Holy Sacrament from those who do not discern His body. The solemn celebration will always be offered for the intentions of the Mission. The celebration on Thursday will be for the benefactors of the

Mission. And in receiving Holy Communion communicants should avoid all excess and extravagance of gesture, all genuflections after receiving (God is then *within* us, think on Him *there*, not on the altar)."

Here the Eucharist, styled previously the "daily Sacrifice," is offered for the unworthy. Nay, more! It is not only for believers who participate, but for the absent who contribute. Money purchases its efficacy. Before communication God is on the altar—after communication God is in the man. This necessitates a transfer of the Deity in the elements by the Priest through the bodily organs of the partaker. The Jesuits of the Vatican could advance no further.

2. There is, among a few extremists, a similar doctrine carefully veiled, yet clearly discernible in the gaudy ceremonialism of an alien Ritualism, opposed at once to the history, the doctrine and the law of the Church.

3. There is a small number of pious and estimable men, whose taste and loyalty alike reject a flippant and tawdry service, aided by lights, and colors, and incense, but who sincerely believe in a local, exterior, objective, yet Spiritual Presence of our Lord on the altar, to be adored and offered in Sacrifice.

4. There is a still narrower circle of those, who, in the very opposite extreme, rushing away from superstition into skepticism, hold principles logically antagonistic to everything supernatural in the Scriptures, and who nearly approach the views of Unitarians and Universalists.

5. There is not a large number, who, orthodox in Faith, disregard our Order, and from excessive Protestant sympathies, dare even to mutilate the offices, and violate the canons of the Church.

6. There is a very numerous and powerful class who admit our Primitive Institution, who concede the fact of Apostolic Succession, who love the Great Creeds, who admire our Liturgy, who observe the restrictions imposed by ordinal and canon on our pulpits, and who yet maintain that Episcopacy is not essential to a true Church.

7. There is a decided majority who believe our Ecclesiastical Order Scriptural, Primitive, Inspired, Divine, and of universal obligation; who would reconcile our Catholicity, and our Protestantism; and whose views of the Sacraments, while various, are within the limits of liberty allowed by our Standards.

Now, it is from such a chaos of warring elements that the Church

has to elaborate a practical unity, while the problem is complicated by the opposite poles of Romanism and Radicalism, constantly drawing to themselves the weak and fluctuating particles. Surely nothing but a wisdom from Heaven can give success in a task so tedious and so complicated.

The first, second, fourth, and fifth classes enumerated may be left to the ecclesiastical tribunals. They are alien enemies in the citadels of the Church. Romanism, Ritualism, and Radicalism secure their defeat by their violence. The illegal excesses of our Metropolis, which so long excited the country, have received recent rebukes which will possibly relieve the General Convention from all further trouble in their suppression. By stirring their ashes it might only revive their embers. The sparks may yet sometimes glimmer, but the flame is, we trust, extinguished.

The third class we have mentioned, not carrying their opinions into ceremonial, and encouraged by the recent decision of the Court of Arches, must be left to itself. It can never be very large, very powerful, or very offensive. The men who compose it are loyal, pious, and prudent. Their opinions seldom come to the surface, and, separated from Ritual, cannot be widely popular. All questions of internal unity therefore reduce themselves practically to the consideration of the last two classes into which we have divided the Church. This is the more certainly true, since they compose the vast majority of our communicants in America. Indeed, they form properly the Church.

Now, in all matters of administration every wise government accommodates itself strictly to facts; over loyal subjects its sway is paternal. Where law is transgressed of course authority must be vindicated. Inevitable parties must, however, be tolerated. Individualities must be consulted. Differences must be compromised. The largest possible circle of liberty must be allowed, compatible with the majesty of the law. On no other principle could our Republic stand one hour. If the State has the spirit of a Father, shall not the Church have the love of a Mother? She must tenderly regard her children as they are, and not as they ought to be; and while reducing to obedience obstinate rebels, she must seek the happiness of her offspring by overlooking their peculiarities, and forgiving their faults. We cannot err in asserting, that, as the General Convention is the supreme authority in the Church,

it should always have such an attitude to all her sincere and faithful members.

And surely our present painful condition needs both peculiar toleration, and peculiar wisdom. Perhaps more than any other communion in the world, our own now requires the grace of charity. We are between enemies whom we seek to reconcile as friends, and we can only accomplish the unity of Christendom by an example of peace among ourselves. Besides, the two acknowledged, and unavoidable schools of opinion have to confront equal difficulties. They have existed in the Church since the Reformation. They can each claim an array of noble names in vindication of their views. They must therefore spring from the very constitution of human nature itself. A wise and large administration will comprehend them both under its care.

To impress more forcibly these considerations we will state some of the embarrassing conclusions which follow from these cherished positions. Take the question of our ecclesiastical Order! All loyal Churchmen agree in holding as *facts* Diocesan Episcopacy and Apostolic Succession, and witness to our Primitive Institution by a practical submission to ecclesiastical legislation. Is not this sufficient for all purposes of government? Where there is acquiescence why should there be strife? Can we forget the difficulties either view involves? Can either be sustained by Scripture alone? Does not the laxity of the first Christians teach us toleration? We can demonstrate our Episcopacy to be Apostolic. We *infer* that it was inspired, and therefore Divine. Here is a chasm to be bridged by a deduction, but not by a proof. Does not this absolutely necessitate divergencies of opinion? If true men, perplexed, here hesitate to pronounce Episcopacy essential to a Church, and to brand Christians, equalling them in piety and zeal, and success, as schismatics beyond the ordinary channels of grace, shall it excite our surprise, or our hostility? Or, on the other hand, if true men reverencing our government as Scriptural, and Apostolic, and Divine, should regard with greater stringency, organizations which have abandoned a Primitive usage made venerable by the observance of fifteen centuries, and pronounce their departure even a sin, we should certainly respect their sincerity and consistency. Or, consider our differences in regard to the Sacrament of Baptism! If we follow ancient Liturgies, if we accept the definition of our

articles, if we are true to the language of our office, we must pronounce it, in the case of the infant, regeneration. But then we are met with the difficulty of considering vast multitudes scattered over every part of Christendom as having been subjects of the new birth, whereas they have never in their lives shown a single grace of the Holy Spirit, and in innumerable instances have been hurried by the forces of their natural corruption into all the excesses of vice, and even the worst atrocities of crime. When we would escape these conclusions by a change in our standards, we are opposed by ancient usage, and by the opinions of long lines of Greek, and Latin, and Anglican Divines. Surely no ecclesiastical government under such circumstances should demand, or expect a rigid uniformity. It should be satisfied if the Law is externally observed. Nor are the difficulties less when we approach the Holy Eucharist. In the pages of the Ancient and of the Anglican Fathers you find innumerable expressions, ascending from the baldest Zwinglianism to what startles us as almost essential Romanism.

And if we seek to alter our standards that we may promote our unity, we hesitate in alarm between the peril of change, and the desire for fellowship. Like the present revisionists of the Bible, we may fear to unsettle faith, impair reverence, and increase divisions. We may yet have to fight over the battles of past centuries. Whatever may be the future, we do not wonder that many deem the present not auspicious for a risk so fearful. Certainly the discordant reports of the Parliamentary Committee in our maternal Church do not encourage any effort to change our Prayer-Book, at the approaching General Convention. In the meantime does not charity demand, that if a clergyman is sincerely troubled in his conscience when he thanks God for the Regeneration of the Infant by His Holy Spirit, while he absolutely discredits the fact, that we shall be tender toward his weakness, and sympathize with his embarrassment? Most certainly on every side we are encircled by perplexities, and if we have before us any peculiar Providential lesson, it is the alphabet of forbearing love. This alone will teach us how to fortify our Church with the very power of the Almighty. The violent extremes of the past few years have drawn the hearts of thoughtful men more closely together, and our General Convention must shape its legislation in that amplitude of wisdom, and of charity which will embrace every individuality

within the limits of possible liberty. Hereafter any party-battles for ascendancy will only result in ruin.

Nay! these considerations may be even more strongly urged. Are there those who are in the Church by birth? They have inherited her spirit from a revered ancestry. They esteem her Order. They magnify her Sacraments. They love her Liturgy. They cherish her observances. It is natural that they should push to an extreme the Churchly element. But, on the contrary, there are multitudes who have been attracted by the beauty of our service, or the circumstance of marriage, or the accident of situation from various Communions, and who cherish the Protestant Faith as their spiritual life. They regard the Reformation as the restoration of Primitive Christianity to a world darkened and corrupted by mediæval usurpation and superstition. They are true to the Church and yet have strong sympathies with their ancestral belief. They are often remarkable, however, for their attachment, for their zeal, for their piety. Now certainly nothing could more promote the health of the entire body than the harmonious commingling of these elements thrown into our midst by unavoidable circumstances. It seems the very plan of Providence that the extremes should correct each other. Every Parish pervaded by the love of Jesus Christ should be strengthened, and beautified by their presence. Instead of causing war and exciting schism, they should produce vigorous growth and harmonious development. Perhaps, if we thoroughly comprehended the design of God, what we consider our greatest bane would become our greatest blessing. The bliss of Heaven does not require a rigid uniformity. All angels are not the same in brightness of glory and largeness of capacity. Variety is the law of the universe.

Now if these views are correct no greater disaster could happen to the Church than organized antagonisms. They perpetuate differences. They make extremes intense. They freeze one party into ice, and kindle the other into flame. They defeat the very design of heaven itself. And yet no man can peruse the pamphlets whose names are placed before this Article, and not have the painful conviction that in this most unfortunate position is the American Church at this very hour. When we glance over her wide territory our sorrow is augmented. In our own metropolis you can select the vast representative Parishes, with their majestic

edifices, which are centres of influences extending over our entire country, and which are separated by barriers as stern, as frowning, as impassable as any which divide us from external communions. Between these conflicting bodies there is suspicion, there is strife, there is often even aversion. They seldom exchange pulpits. They have a different literature. They have different seminaries. They have different organizations. They have different sympathies. They have different aims. Their contributions flow in different channels. Their labors are pursued in different methods. They present almost the spectacle of a Church within a Church, or rather a Church against a Church. Each part seeks the ascendancy, and boasts its triumphs. The future is scanned to ascertain the probabilities of ultimate victory. Good men mourn the dismal strife in tears, in humiliation, and sometimes in despair. Is it wonderful that they turn their eyes to the General Convention for some measure of relief? Can that venerable body be deaf to their cry? Is there no method of escape? Is unity a dream, a phantom, a delusion? Is the Body of Christ to be torn by friends as well as rent by enemies? Is the hand to bruise the foot? Is the eye to fight the ear? Is the heart to hate the head? While foes battle without the citadel shall there be blood, and wounds and death within? Surely God has not deserted His Church. The path to unity may be long, and difficult, and tedious, but it leads *somewhere* into light.

Perhaps we may be pardoned for venturing a few suggestions on a subject which touches thus nearly the hearts and hopes of so many pious men and women scattered over this boundless American heritage.

One fact seems obvious at our very starting point. The Church is absolutely responsible for the welfare of her members. She has a trust she can never delegate. She has a responsibility she can never yield. She has a supervision she can never cease. In three departments especially should her legislation be immediate, constant, indefeasible. All her interests for time and for eternity centre in the Education of her Ministry, the Diffusion of her Literature, and the Dissemination of her Truth. Now we have a General Theological Seminary amenable to her jurisdiction, and we have Local Theological Seminaries not amenable to her jurisdiction. Students with differing tendencies of education, and of opinion,

instead of correcting extreme views by the intercourses of association, and study, and recitation, are separated into antagonistic bodies, and intensified in prejudice, and hardened by instruction, they graduate to begin the work of peace with hostilities of feeling which are to be perpetuated during life. Sometimes it is to be feared there is even a strife between parties to multiply candidates for the ministry, and hasten processes and increase ascendancy by an increase of numbers. The excellent gentlemen who conduct the affairs of the Society for the increase of the Ministry, and the Evangelical Education Society, and the Professors of our Seminaries are certainly as a body far above such a suspicion, and yet there is an unconscious temptation arising from their inevitable antagonism hard to be resisted.

In Literature we find the same organized opposition. The Church Book Society, and the Evangelical Knowledge Society are hostile, unavoidably hostile, in spirit and in policy. We have only to examine their catalogues to be convinced of the fact. Now if the volumes they publish and sell were equally distributed among our Parishes they would represent the entire Church and contribute to the healthful vigor of our people. But what circulates here is forbidden yonder. Here soon what is welcomed by one people is absolutely detested by another. Thus the misapprehension and alienation go on widening and deepening during generations. Here we then have the spectacle of organizations which should be united in a single work pursuing inimical ends without the faintest responsibility to the Church. They never report to the General Convention. Their catalogues are never scrutinized by the General Convention. They never acknowledge, so far as we can ascertain, any amenabilities to the General Convention.

When we examine the relations of our Board of Missions, and the Church Missionary Society, the situation and the result are still more deplorable. Here is organization against legislation. Here is individual effort in the very face of an authorized provision. Nay, worse; here is a corporation with the seal of the State, holding property, collecting funds, commissioning laborers on the very ground that the Church is unsound in her doctrine, and untrue to her trust. We have therefore in the vineyard of our Lord two classes of workmen, one charging heresy and the other charging schism, and thus everywhere over the world going forth for the

evangelization of the nations with the spirit of war instead of the gentleness of peace. We venture to affirm that such an anomaly is without a parallel in any ecclesiastical body of this country.

Now we take the broad ground that every scheme of Education or Evangelization should be under the supreme supervision and control of the Church. She is responsible before Earth and Heaven. Let her part with her authority to any individuals, or any associations not immediately amenable to her Great General Council, and she is virtually scattering everywhere the seeds of discord and schism, instead of peace and love. The proposition, we know, was discussed keenly and ably many years since by the most gifted men of the Church, or nation. It need not be again argued. Time has furnished a demonstration. Repeated strife, organized trouble, multiplied embarrassments have settled the question both in principle and in policy.

But at the same time the General Convention by acquiescence has given sanction to Voluntaryism. Custom has made the Law. Even the Church Missionary Society can plead for its operations the toleration of authority. Against the legal rights of similar associations to existence nothing can certainly now be urged. Yet desperate as is the permitted evil it may not be too hazardous at least to hint a plain and practical plan which in the long lapse of years may restore the Church to her normal unity. We are aware how delicate is even a modest suggestion. A spark intended to light a lamp may explode a magazine.

If it be true that every society to promote Education, to diffuse Knowledge, or assist Evangelization in the Church should be under the inspection and direction of her Supreme Council, we have only considerately and delicately to reduce our principle into practice. Let all voluntary organizations for these vast purposes be requested, or required, to make a triennial report to the General Convention. This would only be acknowledging by an express canon what is now conceded by tacit consent. But it would also be the assertion of a great principle. It would be a return to right itself. It would be the resumption of an inalienable trust and responsibility. It would lodge the control of the greatest and holiest interests of the Church precisely where they should always have found their support and direction. But it would do more. It would at a stroke remove that feeling of antagonism which poisons and paralyzes all our

movements. Men who are enemies would be converted into friends. Legalize their relation by an express statute, and you invest them with a new dignity, and give them a new incentive to loyalty, and a new motive for love. Precisely how the General Convention should dispose of the Triennial Reports beyond their reception and publication would have to be left to its own delicacy and generosity. Should the measure indicated be likely to excite opposition, let a Committee on Internal Unity be appointed which shall kindly hear all complaints, answer all objections, and remove all prejudices. We can conceive nothing like such a measure of large, liberal, maternal legislation which would so probably introduce a new era of confidence and love.

Nor must it be supposed in suggesting this plan we would weaken the Evangelical Protest against Romanizing error. We would simply change its form, and temper its intensity. That there are a few in our midst who are essential Papists, we have demonstrated in this Review. While such an alien party exists, however small, we will concede to no man a more anxious desire, or a greater boldness in resisting its claim. But suppose the scheme mentioned should eventually merge our opposing Church organizations—as is certainly its aim—until we should present the spectacle of a substantial Catholic Unity in faith, and in fact. Need we therefore cease our Protest against exceptional error? Have we not the Pulpit? Have we not the Press? Have we not a voice and a vote in our Conventions? How much better for our Protestantism to express itself in these legitimate ways than to divide and disturb organizations which should only breathe peace and love! Assuredly neither the world nor the Church would regret the loss of certain kinds of annual eloquence which will never greatly promote faith, or increase charity.

And where, we ask, in the world is a body with so many motives to remember in how much they agree, and in how little they disagree, as the loyal Churchmen of this country? Especially should our clergy be united in heart and in purpose. Do they have historic differences in their views of Order, and Succession, and Sacraments? Yet they have the same Ordination. They have the same Creeds. They have the same Liturgy. They have the same Articles. They have the same foes. They have the same interests. Let them have the same charity, and the same triumph

in promoting the salvation of mankind and the glory of the Church!

Nor in considering questions of internal peace must we forget questions of external unity. We must seek to grasp and complete our whole mission. Why should we increase or continue our alienation from the great Protestant Communions? Our Clergymen in their Parishes suffer often from the loneliness of an extreme isolation. They are solitary in their work. They are regarded with suspicion and dislike. This unquestionably results from the bar placed by our Canon to the interchanges of clerical service. But can we not mitigate the antagonism without conceding a principle? Have we not strong sympathies of Faith with Christians around us which can find a legitimate expression? Need we feel like strangers amid brethren who reject our Order? Hitherto all propositions towards union have been rebuffed because they are understood to imply an absolute submission to the hands of our Bishops. The movement in this form has plainly been premature. But could not our General Convention, maintaining our fundamental ecclesiastical principles, yet devise some messages of fraternal sympathy with a few of the principal Protestant bodies dispersed over our Republic, which would promote fellowship, and prepare the way for a future understanding? The question may not be unworthy of consideration. We believe a new Literature might be prepared, and scattered through this country, which, without exciting hostility, would yet present our Apostolic claim to thoughtful men in such a manner as greatly to mitigate prejudice, and extend our influence.

And when we look beyond Protestantism, and sigh for external unity, we are not to be discouraged by the present aspects of Greek and Latin Christianity. Papal Infallibility, indeed, arises like a barrier of frowning rocks. The recently reported conversations of the Archbishop of Syra, even amid the blaze of his English welcome, show that the difficulties, as formerly presented in this Review, were not magnified by the writer. But are there not, at the same time, many hopeful indications? The very dogma of Papal Infallibility, declared amid darkness, and lightning, and tempest, contains in itself the prophecies of vast elemental commotions more terrible than the gloom which filled the church of St. Peter, and the thunder which shook its walls. Every nation in Europe has been alienated. The humiliation of his Holiness, and

the ruin of his Imperial defenders will leave an impression on the human mind not soon to be effaced. All Protestant interpreters of the Apocalypse have agreed in fixing this as the era of Papal decline, and the startling events of the past year confirm their views. A powerful party is rising in Italy, and in Germany, and in France, who are determined on ecclesiastical Reform. The movements of Russia towards fixing her capital on the Golden Horn are not only significant of the overthrow of the Turks, but of a new epoch in the Empire of the Czars. Let the Cross supplant the crescent on St. Sophia; let the Greek rite be once more celebrated within those venerable walls; let Russia on the Bosphorus come into immediate contact with the currents of modern civilization, and ecclesiastical changes will ensue, great as those produced in the State by the emancipation of the serf, and in the Church, by the increased freedom of the clergy. Even the Armenian and Coptic Churches will be open to reform. The light of a brighter day will burst over those dark regions. Shall we not prepare to hasten its diffusion by liberal and sagacious measures? Let us begin at once to place ourselves in sympathy with the progressive movements of the old European, and Asiatic, and African Churches. Let us assist the struggling. Let us explain our position. Let us seek the removal of all barriers to communion, and grasp the world in our plans. The very effort will enlarge our views, and increase our charities. Perhaps the Italian, and Russo-Greek Committees, who reported so ably to our last General Convention, might extend and perpetuate their zealous labors by having placed before them the vast subject of universal unity with all Christians beyond our own fold. Thus, within and without, would the Church give expression to her whole genius, and be placed in an attitude to accomplish her whole mission.

But there is a final and more spiritual aspect, under which we may regard the subject of this Article. History renders it probable, that all heresy and schism have had their ultimate roots in restrained prayer, and consequent inactivity. Where Christians are at once in communion with heaven, and striving to bless earth, Satan finds no soil for his seeds of error. The man is pre-occupied. He is too busy for the tempter. What is true of individuals, is true of communions. It may be doubted, if the Church were fully awake to her practical responsibilities, whether there would be

time, or inclination for strife. Now what will restore us to primitive love, to primitive zeal, to primitive activity? We answer—Prayer, Preaching, Sacraments, Discipline. Do our closets witness the outpouring of hearts yearning for the unity of the Church, and the salvation of the world? And is the Pulpit faithful? We have certainly avoided the popular arts and tricks, which disfigure our times, and dazzle and mislead the people. But do we, as clergymen, preach directly to the hearts and consciences and lives of men? Do we rebuke their sins? Do we seek their conversion? Do we long for their salvation? Do we proclaim faithfully, boldly, earnestly, those great fundamental truths which bring to penitence, and faith, and a new life? Above all other things, do we aim to establish them personally in our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ? Or, admitting fidelity in the Pulpit, do we carry our fidelity into Discipline? Nothing can be more painful than an intimate knowledge of the characters and lives of many who kneel before our altars to partake of the Holy Communion, and it may be doubted whether we shall attain a strong and manly Christianity until we have the faith and power to rebuke the transgressor, and repel the unworthy. It is certainly from deficiency here, that sentimentalism so often takes the place of piety. Sometimes the price of the pew comes between us and the soul of the owner. We are tempted from duty, because we fear to drive wealth and members from our congregations. There can be no more subtle snare to clergymen, as a class, and with them, to be true in action, is to be in spirit martyrs. Now it is to be doubted, whether the Church will ever attain her unity until prayer baptizes our pulpits with the Holy Ghost, and fidelity arms us with strength for the administration of discipline. A vigorous age demands vigorous action.

But it is not to be concealed, that the adoption of the measure suggested in this Article, would be but a temporary remedy. It could, at most, only prepare our way for a deeper and truer relief. The position of this Review has always been for the Prayer Book as an entirety, and for the toleration of all parties who submit to the ecclesiastical law. Our General Convention has virtually stood on a similar basis. At its coming session its traditional conservatism will not probably be changed. But radical questions will arise in the future. Those who now control the Church can cer-

tainly claim for their cause both the letter and spirit of our sacramental offices. Explanations in regard to Priest and Sacrifice, and Infant Regeneration from the opposite section are simply peace-offerings to conscience. They have the weakness of apologies. A manly concession to truth is always certain strength. Our people receive the language in its plain meaning. A whole class of questions, therefore, may arise again for investigation, far back of anything ever discussed in our pages. Is the Scripture the *only* rule of Faith? Is it the only authoritative guide in what is essential to ecclesiastical organization? Is it the only test of what should be incorporated in a Baptismal or Communion office? How far are we bound by the doctrinal consensus of the Primitive Fathers? Is the decree of our Ecumenical Council irrevocable, and universal in its obligations? These questions touch the roots of all our controversies. We may delay, we can never prevent their final investigation. Perhaps our deepest wisdom would be to open some established Periodical of the Church to an exhaustive discussion, conducted by our best ability and learning, and free from all partiality, partizanship and personality. Especially let our Theological Faculties be invited to participate. The Articles contributed could then be scattered through every part of our Communion, furnished thus with light to shape our future for the coming ages. Under the blessing of Heaven such a plan might eventuate not only in peace for ourselves, but in unity for Christendom.

OUR BOOK TABLE.

YESTERDAY, TO-DAY AND FOREVER.*

In the plan of this Poem is an incongruity which we have not seen noticed. The narrator describes his own death. We see his wife kneeling at his bed, and his children weeping around their

* A Poem in Twelve Books. By Edward Henry Bickersteth, M.A., Incumbent of Christ Church and Chaplain to the Bishop of Ripon. New York: Carter & Brothers, 530 Broadway, 1871.

expiring father. At last the earthly tabernacle sinks away, and the released spirit, a moment in suspense, bursts into the world of joy. It here meets Ariel, an angel-guardian, who conducts its flight through innumerable throngs peopling the earth, and air, towards Hades. On quick wing the blissful pair sweep forward along an avenue leading through mountainous clouds gorgeously tinted, piled over a ravine, and bright with the reflected glory of Paradise, while, before the radiant canopy is passed, another road is seen stretching into a darkness whence issue the sighings of despair. Soon they enter the gates of pearl, and the spirit of the narrator beholds the Saviour in the love and majesty of His exaltation, and clasps His feet in tears. Not long after, two departed children are met. Eva is described as :

“A bud of life folded in leaves of love :
The dewy morning star of Summer days ;
The golden lamp of happy fire-side hours ;
The little ewe-lamb nestling by our side ;
The dove, whose cooing echoed in our hearts ;
The sweetest chord upon our harp of praise ;
The quiet spring, the rivulet of joy ;
The pearl among His gifts who gave us all.”

Constance, the other child,

“Had trodden a longer, rougher pathway home,
And not unset with thorns.”

“Every step
Ta'en by her little bleeding feet had left
Its tracery on her spirit now,
In tender lines of love, and peace, and praise.”

After a period of transport in Paradise, the Prison of the Lost is seen amid surging clouds, smoking, and flashing, and rolling in the distance. When this dark survey is completed, Ariel travels back into the past of the ages, and describes the Creation, and the Fall ; and then follows the history of our race down through the scenes of our Saviour's birth, life, death, and exaltation. He paints in vivid words the early struggles of the Church, usually employing the grand imagery of the Apocalyptic vision, and passing our present age, sweeps boldly forward to the Millenium, the Judgment, and the final glory of the Redeemed in the great Eternity beyond. Now, it is to be remembered the spirit who narrates to us these sublime events has left behind our own period, and at-

tained his own resurrection, and exaltation. He is a part and a witness of these stupendous scenes. He sees the triumphant Church. He sees the Bridal of the Lamb. He sees the earth and the sea give up their dead. He sees the great white Throne. He sees the Judge giving the final awards. He sees the world wrapped in fire, and from the chaos of flame its globe emerging into its perfect and eternal glory. He paints in language glowing and beautiful his own resurrection :

"Not otherwise that hour, nor less with joy,
We all invisible to mortal sight,
Enwrapped in circling clouds from pole to pole
A thin pure veil of disembodied spirits—
And nearing now our birth-land; at a word
That with electric speed circled the globe,
Bore downward through the realms of air."

"Herbert nor I,
Nor any, lost one moment's consciousness.
It was a village church-yard where I lighted,
My wife, my babes, beside me on the left,
My parents, and my chasten'd sister's spirit,
Our angel-guardians, hanging on our steps.
But even as we touch'd the solid earth
The Lord Himself descended with a shout
Loud as of torrent-floods into mid-heaven,
His bright cherubic glory veil'd in clouds
Of dazzling glory."

Here then underlying the whole structure of a Poem, in many respects original and admirable, is a painful impossibility. Our narrating spirit passing through centuries of existence comes back from a distant future to describe its realities, already enacted, and become a part of the history of the universe to us in the present hour. Imagination may bridge the difficult and supply the obscure, but cannot tolerate the absurd. Even Pollok, whose fiery genius was often so crude and rash, avoided the impossible. Ages after the history of our world has been consummated, he represents an Angel, overwhelmed with the spectacle of Hell, soaring to inquire its cause from elder spirits of light, who conduct him to a Bard of earth accustomed to sing the marvels of both Creation and Redemption. The "Course of Time" is thus a consistent picture of the mighty Past of the universe. We observe in Dante also a perfect harmony of scheme. The Poet is led by the shade of Vir-

gil through the circles of Hell and the abodes of Purgatory. And Beatrice conducts him in Paradise from the moon and the planets, to the stars where he has a glimpse of that crowning glory which brightens around the mystery of the Trinity. In the Epic of Milton there is an unbroken uniformity of plan from the moment when we see Satan tossing in the waves of fire, through all the councils and conflicts and experiences of angels and devils and men which diversify the sublime history of the eternal ways of God in Creation, and Providence, and Redemption.

But while we notice in "Yesterday, To-Day, and Forever," this strange, this startling, this irremediable defect pervading its fundamental structure, we must not close our vision to many beauties which make the Poem deservedly popular, and may make it deservedly enduring. The incongruity mentioned will indeed always bar it from a high place on the scroll of the Muse, when it is regarded merely as a work of art. It has, however, excellencies independently of art, and even against art. There is a place for it better than the niche of fame. We believe it will live in the *heart* of the Christian. Let us endeavor to find its peculiar position in our religious Poetry.

There is in Dante a barbarous and repulsive particularity of delineation arising rather from his age than from his genius. It is horrible to see men roasting in flames, burning in tombs, immersed in blood, tortured by snakes. The Hell of the great Italian is a materialism reminding us of the tortures of an Inquisition where Priests delighted to pinch the flesh with red hot iron, to wrench limbs from their sockets, and pour down the throat streams of molten lead. His Heaven is not attractive. There is in its imagery a perplexing and intricate ingenuity which renders it often puerile and often contemptible. It is a creation of Dante and not a picture from the Bible. On the other hand we are almost oppressed with the excessive beauty and overwhelming sublimity of Milton. He dwells either in a darkness which appals, or a light which dazzles. The sweep, the vastness, the grandeur of his thoughts transport us from the realms of common life. He walks the universe alone, and describes its wonders as if he formed no part of its substance, or its history. He resembles not his own companionable Raphael, or familiar Gabriel, so much as the majestic Michael. He awes and dazzles us with his matchless mag-

nificence. He can therefore never live in the sympathies of our race.

Pollok also belongs to an unearthly region. On the farm and in the college he was isolated from any large experiences of life, and he knew men rather from books than observation. Disease early quenched the flames of passion, and increased the intensity of fancy. Pollok wrote like a young prophet, prematurely old, sitting on the side of his grave, and painting in wild, crude, and impetuous words awful visions of the future. He bears us along with him through Eternity rather on a tide of fire than a tide of love. He had no familiarity with those feelings, opened in the heart by the mysterious relations of marriage and paternity, and essential to complete our manhood and unite us in full sympathy with mankind.

Now these observations will prepare us to understand the characteristic excellences of Mr. Bickersteth. His poem opens with lines which are almost prosaic. There is nothing attractive in the thought or in the rhythm. We are disappointed and yet we are interested. The scene rather than the style is regarded. Before us is a dying Christian, whose spirit is hovering around the sanctuary of an earthly home, beautified with love and hallowed with tears, and about to be transported into that mysterious world where it expects to behold the forms of saints, and shapes of angels, and the glory of the Saviour. As the poet proceeds he improves in the music of his verse, the beauty of his expressions, and in the glow of his imagination. Our hearts are enlisted, our fancies are excited, our curiosity is stimulated. We feel ourselves in a new world not only of wonder but of affection. The hold thus obtained by the poet on our sympathies is never entirely lost, even when he ventures to describe scenes which compel us to dwarf him in comparison with the matchless Milton. His pictures of Pandemonium and Paradise are tame and poor compared with those of the Master-Bard. We almost marvel that his pencil here did not refuse its office. To describe the scorn, the rage, the hate of Satan and his fiends under that arch of tempestuous flame, and amid those billows of surging fire, having read the *Paradise Lost*, is like painting another Last Judgment beneath the immortal creation of Michael Angelo in the Sistine Chapel. And so in regard to Eden and the creation and fall of Adam. To sing these after Milton is

a daring attempt. It challenges comparison and compels contrast. You admire a star for its own beauty, but cannot marvel to see it pale when it places itself beside a sun. In Literature as in Art some things have been so perfectly done that they should never be tried. Phidias once for all chiselled Jupiter. Raphael once for all painted St. Cecilia. Michael Angelo once for all completed St. Peter's. Shakspeare once for all created Hamlet. And Milton once for all has described Pandemonium and Paradise.

Mr. Bickersteth, however, was compelled by the necessity of his theme, to pass over regions already appropriated by preoccupying genius. This was the misfortune of his birth. We have no hesitation in saying that he has succeeded marvellously in his effort. No living Poet could have done so well. Besides, he has so charmed and propitiated us by the tender and melting scenes, which he describes in his First Book, that we are inclined to forgive his unavoidable rashness. In an age when Milton and Dante are more admired for binding and illustration than for beauty and sublimity, few will be offended by his temerity, and we are not certain that his Book will not be more widely read, and more practically useful than the productions of superior genius. We cordially commend it to American Christians. It will stimulate their affections. It will increase faith. It will enlarge the circles of thought. It will supply piety with many lines, and sentiments, and images of beauty. It will make familiar the mysterious world of departed spirits, touching so nearly the sphere of our present being, without detracting from its dignity and solemnity. It, moreover, possesses one peculiar merit. Mr. Bickersteth has avoided in a Christian Poem, Pagan imagery, and draws his illustrations chiefly from the exhaustless stores of the Bible. The Spirit of the Gospel, even amid scenes of terror, is constantly breathing around us the subduing tenderness of love.

We will close our Review of "Yesterday, To-Day, and Forever," by extracting some passages which will enable our readers to see the merit of Mr. Bickersteth, where he attempts different kinds of description.

"Immediately I rose;
My spiritual essence to my faintest will
Subservient, as is flame to wind, and gazed,
Myself invisible, around. O sight,

Surpassing utterance, when the mists that veiled
That border land of Heaven, and Earth, and Hell
Dispersed !”

“ There were more spirits than men, more habitants
Of the thin air than of the solid ground ;
The firmament was quick with life.”

“ Flushed with wine there pass'd
A young man through the solitary streets,—
Not solitary to angelic eyes—
Home to his father's house ; a dark spirit waved
A fascinating spell before his face ;
And straightway to those tents of wickedness
He bent his easy steps, and, as he cross'd
The threshold through the crowd invisible,
I heard their fiendish laugh of triumph. Soon
Another on the call of charity
With haste that dimly-lighted pavement trod,
And him the spirits malign assay'd to draw
With the same sorcery ! but an angel stoop'd
And interposed his buckler, and the youth
Went on unscathed, though mindless of the peril.
A lonely garret drew my eye ; for there
A flood of roseate brilliance streamed afar—
There on a bed of straw a sufferer lay
Feeble, but strong in faith, and by her side
Two of Heaven's noblest principalities
Kept watch.”
“ But now another sight attracted me ;
'Twas but a children's orphanage ; but there,
Say, is it Jacob's ladder once again
Planted upon the earth ? Such forms of light
Were passing to and fro continually.”

We will quote, in an opposite strain, a passage from the *Battle of the Angels*, as it will show us that our Poet, while on the ground of Milton, does not servilely follow Milton.

“ Through twice ten thousand leagues,
Each touching each, his millions stretched—such clouds
And exhalations had the Apostate Fiend
Around his throne of evil circumfused.
But as we stood at gaze, a furnace blast
Rush'd from those bastions forth, and storms of hail
As sharp rocks hurl'd from countless catapults
With whirlwind fury on our armies smote.”
“ But when the terrible Simoon had pass'd,
No son of light had moved, none touch'd with fear,

None counsell'd base retreat. Such lofty strength,
 God in the hearts of all infused. And lo,
 Michael stretch'd forth his spear, and instantly,
 Quick as the lightning's flash, from east to west
 The watchword ran, and even as we were,
 We plunged into those beetling clouds."

"For each one
 His armor forged of diamond and light,
 Made a luminous foothold, and for each
 The breath of his own lips before him gave
 A dubious path."

"Wounds were received and given
 By weapons upon divers anvils wrought,
 Keen, ghastly, fiery wounds."

"As Ariel spake
 He had his hand upon a scar that seam'd
 His forehead, which not unobserved before,
 Only appeared a line of deeper thought,
 No foul disfigurement; but added power,
 And more majestic royalty of mien."

SERMONS FOR THE CHRISTIAN YEAR.*

It is the impurity of the medium which makes the gorgeousness of the morning and the evening. When the sun shines down from mid-heaven through a clear atmosphere the sky shows no splendor. So we sometimes fear that the eloquence which dazzles in sermons borrows its brilliance from genius partially sanctified. The discourses of our Lord and His Apostles which have produced such marvellous results were certainly characterized with the most unadorned simplicity. Scriptural themes touching the Cross and Eternity seem deprived of their impressiveness and majesty when imbued with the colors of a mere human rhetoric. Thus amid all the powerful argumentation and rich imagery of even Bourdaloue, and Bossuet, and Massillon, and Taylor, and Chalmers there is in the soul often a painful sense of want. We have remarked in another place how comparatively little there is in the splendid discourses of Robertson and Beecher to guide a sincere penitent directly to faith in our Lord Jesus Christ as an atoning, present, perfect Saviour. It may be doubted whether plain men will feel

* By the Rev. William H. Lewis, D.D., Rector of Christ Church, Watertown, Conn. Fifth Edition, Revised and Enlarged. In Three Volumes. Hartford Church Press Company, 1870.

their spiritual needs fully satisfied by a study of their brilliant sermons, and we are free to say that we have derived more practical benefit from the unpretending pages of Dr. Lewis than from some of the magnificent discourses of the most renowned pulpit masters, ancient or modern. Their artless simplicity is their chief charm. Profound reasoning and shining eloquence challenge opposition, provoke criticism, excite the intellect, fascinate the imagination, gratify the taste, but seldom awake the conscience, move the heart or change the life. A picture of the Judgment in words, however grand and startling, has little more effect on the man than a picture of the Judgment in colors. Michael Angelo's great painting in the Sistine Chapel has as much tendency to convert a soul from sin to the Cross as the most admired sermons describing the same stupendous scenes, and if we wish for mere argument we prefer the quiet of the closet to the excitement of the congregation. Thoughtful persons in our practical age are beginning to recoil from that ornate eloquence which draws and charms the multitude, and seek relief for their spiritual needs in more pure, plain and primitive forms of stating truth. This class will be edified by the simple sermons of Dr. Lewis. He does not deal in the tints of the sunset, the aurora, and the rainbow. His style resembles the white light without refracted hues. You think of his meaning and not of his words. Dr. Lewis forgets himself in his subject. You feel he loves the truth and your soul. He flashes no sky-rockets. But he does place before you in simple language and with clear arrangement the faith of the Gospel in its true relations, and due proportions, so that, while you perceive the plan of Salvation through Jesus Christ with your intellect, you would also embrace it in your heart and carry it into your conduct. He does not give you partial statements. In these artless volumes you find the Gospel of your Master in its completeness and symmetry. You feel that you have been conversing with a loving minister of the Church who has studied the scheme of Redemption through the Cross in the learning of books, and who has also pondered it in the experiences of his own heart, and who goes before you as a gentle shepherd, clothed indeed with the authority of Heaven, yet above all things anxious to guide you through the trials and perils of the wilderness to the pastures of Eternal Life. We should conceive it an inestimable benefit to be under the instructions of such a

Preacher. We have ventured to appear excessive in our praise, and to depart from the very simplicity we recommend and admire, because we believe that Dr. Lewis is not to be elated by the poor praises of a fellow-mortal, and because we think that modest merit in a meretricious age should receive a proper acknowledgment. To show that we have not exaggerated, we propose to give a few extracts from the volumes on our table, equally commendable for sound doctrine and clear statement.

"If Jesus was only a martyr, He ought to have had divine supports in His dying hour, yet they were withdrawn from Him. If He were only a martyr the chief anguish should have been bodily, but that of Jesus was mental, and His bodily sufferings wrung from Him no complaint. We can easily solve this difficulty. We believe that in the death of Jesus it pleased the Lord to bruise Him and to put Him to grief, and the Lord then made His *soul* an offering for sin. We believe that in that hour in Gethsemane, God was crowding the sufferings, which the sins of the world deserved, upon the innocent Jesus, and that He was made willing to bear them for us. We believe that He was tasting in that cup which He prayed might pass away, and yet submissively took, as much of the misery of Hell as He could possibly endure. We believe that when He cried out on the cross, "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me," that it was not an unfounded complaint, but that God had forsaken Him as He does the spirit in torment, and had given Him to know, as far as He could know, what we should have experienced if God had cast us off forever. In all this transaction, His soul bore the same miseries that ours would have borne if He had not died. So that God made to meet upon Him the iniquity of us all, and the chastisement of our peace was upon Him. Dark as was that night in Gethsemane and dark as were those hours on the Cross, there was a deeper darkness in the soul of the Redeemer, for the blackness of the pit involved Him, and sunlight and the light of God's countenance were at the same time withdrawn from Him—He was the sinner's substitute. He was laden with the sins of the whole world, as the lamb of the Jewish offering was with the sins of the offerer. No wonder that He groaned under such a burden, that He sweat drops of blood, that He cried out to God who had forsaken Him. This explains also the whole Jewish sacrificial system, where so many thousand victims died in the place of sinners to typify Christ the Lamb of God dying in the stead of a world of sinners. And this explains those thousand texts which speak of Christ as dying, the just for the unjust, as giving His life a ransom for all, as the propitiation for our sins."

Dr. Lewis states clearly and admirably the whole doctrine of a penitent sinner's Justification by Faith in this atoning Saviour, and at the same time guards this grand central truth of the inner life from all antinomian perversions. His reconciliation between St. Paul and St. James is particularly satisfactory.

"All Christians allow that faith is necessary for our justification, but some have contended that good works are also necessary. The controversy depends, in some degree, upon the meaning of the word *law* in our text. If St. Paul meant to say, that we are justified by faith without regard to our obedience to *any* law, whether natural or revealed, then of course he meant to exclude our works altogether as having no part, neither in meriting nor procuring our justification. Now that such *was* his meaning will be evident if we attend to his course of reasoning. In the first chapter of this Epistle to the Romans, he labors to show that the Gentiles had sinned against the law of nature which was written in their hearts; and in the second and third chapters, that the Jews had equally transgressed the *written* law; and then having thus shown that all the world was 'guilty before God,' he concludes 'therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified,' and that a man is 'justified by faith without the deeds of the law.' The law spoken of in our text then, evidently includes both of those of which he had been before speaking, that is the law of nature and the revealed moral law; and if we are justified by faith without regard to our obedience to either of these laws, then good works are of no account in our justification."

To show how perfectly this teaching of St. Paul agrees with the seemingly opposite doctrine of St. James, Dr. Lewis explains with perfect clearness the question of the latter Apostle—"Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar?"

"Now if Abraham can be proved to have been *already justified* before he offered Isaac, it will show that it was not the justification of his *person* to which St. James alludes. But this fact is expressly asserted in Scripture, for we are there told that many years before this, "Abraham believed in the Lord, and it was counted to him for righteousness." He was already then before he offered Isaac in a justified state, and consequently his offering could not have justified him. It cannot then, be the justification of Abraham's *person* to which St. James refers; it must therefore be the justification of his *faith*. He meant to say, that the high degree of obedience which Abraham manifested in offering up his son justified his faith, or showed that he had true faith, for God, and man might see by the effects which it produced that there was in reality a living principle of faith within him."

Dr. Lewis in a few simple words sets forth very lucidly the usual argument for Episcopacy as seen in the history of St. James.

"That Church polity, which was marked out by Christ in person, or through His Apostles, if there be any such, must be the best, and must be binding on the Church in all ages. We hold that in St. James, as first Bishop of Jerusalem, we have Diocesan Episcopacy set forth as the Scriptural form of Church government, and any plain unlettered man, by examining the passages of Scripture now to be noticed, will hardly fail of concluding that St. James did hold that office, and consequently, that Diocesan Episcopacy is of Scriptural authority, and binding in all ages."

This is the only place in the volumes of Dr. Lewis where he has demonstrated the plain when he should have illuminated the obscure. What he says in regard to the Episcopate of St. James seems undeniable. That Bishops were appointed by the Apostles themselves in the great centres of religious and commercial activity can be satisfactorily established. In the Scripture we have clearly three orders in the Church. There was first the Apostolate. There was second in time but not in degree, the Diaconate. There was third the Presbyterate, or Episcopate. Afterwards inspired Apostles substituted for their own temporary office the Episcopate which came first in rank, while the Presbyterate was made second, and the Diaconate third. Now the real difficulty pressed by our adversaries is, that judging by Scripture alone, the Church is not now constituted precisely as it can be proven to have afterwards been by history. They demand not only apostolic precedent, but express injunction. They urge that they must have the explicit warrant of the inspired Scriptures, and not the historic statements of uninspired fathers to prove that the Church in her three orders is of divine institution, and of universal obligation. They may concede all we claim as fact, and yet deny all we claim as inference. Just here they should be instructed by our learned Doctors and theological Faculties. We would welcome to the pages of the Review an able argument on the very point usually passed over in silence. It is here that Presbyterianism most strenuously defends its founders for departing from Apostolic example, and the usage of fifteen centuries, and passing by the traditions of the Church to the pages of the Scripture.

However, we intend no censure upon Dr. Lewis for omitting this part of his argument. His discourses are necessarily brief, and such discussions are scarcely suitable for a popular assembly. We will conclude by again expressing our opinion that, while his sermons make no pretension to extensive learning, profound argumentation, or glittering eloquence, yet for simple and practical instruction in whatever pertains to Christian faith and practice they have no superiors in the Church. For the Lay reader they will be especially suitable. They cannot be spared from any Parish library. In the closet they will prove a constant source of edification, strength and comfort. Their accommodation to the ecclesiastical calendar will, to the true Churchman, prove an additional attraction.

ANTE-NICENE CHRISTIAN LIBRARY.*

WE are more and more convinced that this invaluable library is destined to work a revolution in the Christian world. Many educated ministers have hitherto been dependent on the mere statements of professed Biblical scholars. They could not find time amid the pressure of daily parish duties to study in the original, countless tomes of erudite Greek and Latin fathers. Our age, with all its superior advantages, was rendering the achievement constantly more difficult by its rush and intensity. Now the treasures of past ages are exposed to the gaze of any clergyman having ordinary attainments and leisure. Indeed, a learned acquaintance in the originals with the works composing the ante-Nicene Library was mostly a sham and an egoism. It presumed the undivided study of years. It presumed the possession of rare and expensive books. It presumed usually a chair in a Theological Faculty.

If clergymen employ their advantages, we venture to assert they will be astonished to find how much they have been imposed upon by assertion, and amused by declamation. They will growingly regard the ancient fathers rather as historic witnesses than infallible guides, rather as companions than instructors, rather as sincere disciples than Christian philosophers. They will more and more esteem the words of God, and less and less esteem the words of man. They will be astonished to find how soon the pure fountains of the Scripture became polluted with turbid waters of human invention. The Ritualist can certainly extract comfort from Tertullian long before he became a Montanist. In his work on *Mono-gamy*, written about A. D. 212, we find an argument against second marriages based on a doctrine cherished by some persons of this present period.

"In short, I ask the woman herself, 'Tell me, sister, have you sent your husband before you to his rest in peace?' What will she answer? Will she say, 'In discord?' In that case she is more bound to him with whom she has a cause to plead at the bar of God. She who is bound to another has not departed from him. But will she say, 'In peace?' In that case she must necessarily persevere in that peace with him whom she will no longer

* Vol. XVII. *The Clementine Homilies. The Apostolical Constitutions.* Vol. XVIII. *The writings of Tertullian.* Vol. III. *With the Extant Works of Victorinus and Commodianus.* Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 38 George St. 1870. New York, Charles Scribner & Co.

have the power to divorce: not that she would, even if she had been able to divorce him, have been marriageable. Indeed she *prays for his soul*, and requests refreshment for him meanwhile, and fellowship with him in the first resurrection, and *she offers her sacrifices in the anniversary of his falling to sleep. For unless she does these deeds, she has in the true sense divorced him, so far as in her lies.*"

In the *Apostolical Constitutions* we have plain proof that the priestly function had assumed a prominence unknown to the Gospels which record the institution of the Eucharist; and that sacrifice was the characteristic office of the ministry. In the form of consecration of a Bishop occur the words:

"Grant to him, O Lord Almighty, through Thy Christ, the fellowship of the Holy Spirit, that he may so have power to remit sins according to Thy command; to give forth lots according to Thy command; to loose every band according to the power which Thou givest the apostles; that he may please Thee in meekness and a pure heart, with a steadfast, unblameable, and unrepachable mind; to offer to Thee a pure and unbloody sacrifice, which by Thy Christ Thou hast appointed as the mystery of the new Covenant."

Nay, if we are to receive the *Apostolical Constitutions* as our guides instead of the Holy Scripture we are to offer more than the elements in the Holy Communion. We find it provided in the third ecclesiastical canon.

"If any Bishop or Presbyter, otherwise than as our Lord has ordained concerning the sacrifice, offer other things at the altar, as honey, milk, or strong beer instead of wine, any necessities, or birds, or animals, or pulse otherwise than is ordained, let him be deprived; *excepting* grains of new corn, or ears of wheat, or bunches of grapes in their season."

The *Apostolical Constitutions* certainly enjoin a species of honor to the Episcopal office not now usually given, especially by those who most magnify its divine institution.

"If, therefore, Moses was called a god by the Lord, let the Bishop be honored among us as a god. The Deacon is enjoined that he must not do anything at all without the consent of the Bishop, nor give anything without his consent."

The Episcopate, however, is by no means above the Law. The seventy-fourth canon provides:

"If a Bishop be accused of any crime by credible and faithful persons, it is necessary that he be cited by the Bishop, and if he comes and makes his apology, and yet is convicted, let his punishment be determined. But if

when he is cited, he does not obey, let him be cited a second time by two Bishops sent to him. But if even then he despises them, and will not come, let the Synod pass what sentence they please against him, that he may not appear to gain advantage by avoiding their judgment."

To those who would apply in the strictness of their letter the Apostolical Constitutions to the American Church, we would commend the perusal of some canons to which they would scarcely subject themselves.

"Let a Clergyman who becomes a surety be deprived." "Of those who come into the Clergy unmarried, we permit only the readers, and singers, if they have a mind, to marry afterward."

"If any Bishop or Presbyter does not perform the three immersions of the one admission, but one immersion, which is given unto the death of Christ, let him be deprived."

"If any one of the Clergy be taken eating in a tavern, let him be suspended, except when he is forced to bait at an inn upon the road."

MEMOIRS OF THE RT. REV. ALONZO POTTER, D.D., LL. D.*

These memoirs are the simple and truthful records of a great and noble man. Many circumstances conspired to shape Bishop Alonzo Potter into a superior mould. He sprang precisely from that condition of life where physical, and mental robustness are most generally united. Early rural occupations and associations disposed him at once to reflectiveness and activity. His father was a man of sturdy sense, and his mother was a woman of strong character, while a Quaker ancestry transmitted to him a tendency towards spirituality and philanthropy. That peculiar period when our country was fresh with heroic memories of the revolution, and preparing to conquer her place among the nations, was favorable to the development of strong principles and of manly enterprise. The impress left on Bishop Potter by the venerable Dr. Nott, and by the pursuits, and associations of his collegiate life, were also visible during his entire career in a polish of scholarship and amplitude of view which are not the least charms in a Christian character beautifully symmetrical and elevated.

Formed under influences so singularly favorable, few men have

* *Memoirs of the Life and Services of the Rt. Rev. Alonzo Potter, D.D., LL. D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Pennsylvania.* By M. A. De Wolfe Howe, D.D., Rector of St. Luke's Church. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1871.

better illustrated or adorned our American Episcopate, and we think he has found in Dr. Howe an appreciative and competent biographer. Possibly the work might have been more condensed, and some controversial questions might have been omitted. But the style is clear and pleasing. The incidents are judiciously selected. The delineations of character are just and striking. You see distinctly before you Alonzo Potter as a man, as a Professor, as a Clergyman, as a Philanthropist, as a Bishop.

And yet, although a record of such superior gifts, and such signal successes, there is a sadness in this biography. We have suggested the singular fact that two brothers, educated under the same circumstances, Clergymen in the same Communion, bound by the same standards, and both elevated to the Episcopate in the two greatest Dioceses of the country, should prove leaders in opposite sections of the American Church. How difficult any visible unity in Christ's Body on earth! Surely there must a fellowship above and beyond mere opinions.

The root-principle of Bishop Alonzo Potter's career is found in his views respecting the Rule of Faith. At this point indeed begin all our divergences in the Church. If controversy is to be hushed, and separation avoided, here must our inquiries be directed. Bishop Potter wrote A. D. 1847:

"For myself I am frank to say that I cannot conceive myself authorized to expect any infallible living expositor appearing to me either necessary, or in accordance with analogy. I cannot regard it as necessary, since experience has shown that, with respect to certain great fundamental truths, there has been a substantial agreement among nearly all who have called themselves Christians, and to multiply greatly the fundamental articles of faith seems to me as unfavorable to unity as it is inconsistent with Scripture; nor can I regard such an infallible interpreter as being in conformity with the general system of God's providence, which makes liability to *error* as well as sin, an essential part of our probation, and the effort necessary in order to avoid it is a most salutary part of our moral discipline."

"It is said that it is only *within the Church* that we can learn which are canonical, or Divine Scriptures. I answer that to me the conclusion by no means seems to follow from the premises, and that the premise itself is untenable. We know which are the Scriptures, and are certified of their credibility and Divine origin, *not by the voice of the Church* proper—but by the consistent testimony of a great number of Christians who give each his testimony, *not in his ecclesiastical, but in his individual capacity.*"

Now, a rigid application of these principles certainly must make

the position of any Episcopal clergyman uncomfortable. Nothing can be clearer than the conclusion from our ordinal and our canon, that all ministries are invalid which are not derived through Bishops in the Apostolical succession. Here is an opinion placing us in practical antagonism to every modern Protestant organization. Can we sustain it simply from the Scripture? Must we not supplement the testimony of the Bible by the witness of the Church? If the Primitive writers are merely individuals expressing their unauthoritative views, how can we found our ecclesiastical order on their human opinions, where certainly, in questions of such momentous import, we need an inspired and infallible standard? Without the Church as interpreted through the Fathers we can neither defend our ordinal, nor our canon before Christendom.

And is the doctrine of the Regeneration of the infant in Baptism inculcated by Scripture? Can it be proved by a single text? Is the subject ever at all treated in the Divine Word? Can you for a moment defend the Baptismal Office separated from the testimony and authority of the Church? No clergyman relying on Scripture *alone*, can, from his heart, give thanks to God in the words, "We thank Thee that Thou hast regenerated this child *by Thy Holy Spirit.*"

And who can defend from Scripture, only, the Communion Office? However, we may assert that Priest means Presbyterian, the word stands unexplained in the Prayer-Book to trace itself on the people. Nor in interpreting it can you pass by the office of Institution which supposes an altar, an offering, and a relation styled *Sacerdotal*. Is all this taught by the Bible alone? Does it appear in our Saviour's language when He enjoined the Eucharist? Can it be defended unless we receive the authority of the Church expressed in her ancient Fathers and Liturgies? Our Ecclesiastical Order and our Sacramental Offices cannot be sustained on the principle that the *Bible is the only authoritative guide*, since they involve questions of government, and of doctrine plainly not settled in the Divine Word. Bishop Hobart's school was consistent with itself, and with the Prayer-Book. If Puseyism, and Ritualism, and Romanism, are its logical sequences, our Liturgy, in its plain, natural, and intended meaning, is responsible.

We express here no individual opinion whether the Bible alone,

or the Bible and the Church, are to furnish our authoritative standard. But, until this question is once more patiently investigated, and satisfactorily determined, we must be content to sow, and reap on a volcano. We may have fellowship of heart but not of opinion. Perhaps this is part of God's design. It may be His plan in His Church to make charity the bond of unity.

MEMOIR OF BISHOP STRACHAN.*

THIS memoir of Bishop Strachan proves that sturdy natures need part with none of their strength in the service of the Church. He was a Scotchman, whose father inclined to be an Episcopalian, and whose mother was a Presbyterian. Thus opposite streams of influence mingled in the current of his life. A blast of a quarry killed Mr. Strachan, and the character of his son was developed chiefly under maternal care. Nothing in the whole career of the Bishop of Toronto is more commendable and beautiful than his ceaseless devotion to his widowed mother, whom he supported until her death at a most advanced age. Filial affection shed a soft light over his stern nature as sunbeams brighten around a rock. His heart in rugged manhood was even more tender than in ardent youth. Mrs. Strachan made no claim to high culture. But she possessed gifts infinitely better than learning can bestow. She was a true woman. She had sterling sense. She had a mother's heart. She leaned on her strong son with trust, and pride, and love. Nor was her affection an idolatry. Nothing can be more tenderly beautiful than one of her faithful letters suggesting a peril to her aspiring boy with a mingled sense of his mental superiority and her own maternal right, which evinces a delicacy of nature, social conventionalities, and educational advantages never yet conferred.

John Strachan was early thrown among Presbyterians. His associates were principally Presbyterians. His teachers were Presbyterians. He graduated in a Presbyterian institution. Dr. Chalmers was his intimate friend. We do not think this a disadvantage. There is perhaps no nobler body of men on earth than

* Memoir of the Right Reverend John Strachan, D. D., LL. D. First Bishop of Toronto. By A. N. Bethune, D. D., D. C. L. His successor in the See. Toronto: Henry Boswell. London: Rivingtons, 1870.

the Presbyterians of Scotland and America, and the Bishop of Toronto lost nothing in strength of principle and inflexibility of will by the peculiar influences of his youth, while his love of the Church was developed and tested by the very independence required for its emancipation from early prejudices and associations. John Strachan and Alonzo Potter show how undeserved the sneer which too frequently meets those who come to us from other communions.

The memoir before us is principally occupied with the career of its subject in Canada. As a teacher he was unrivaled. Some of the best minds in the province were shaped under his care. His discipline was rigorous, but it was fruitful in the noblest results. It invigorated the will. It stimulated the energies. It educated the conscience. It encouraged the affections. It made *men*. One of the best parts of Bishop Bethune's admirable book is that describing the Cornwall Grammar School. We commend it to the namby-pambyism of our own country. Its "black Mondays" in the United States would be bright omens of increased manliness among our youth, who are fast degenerating into the insidious conceit that the chief end of their lives is to be pleased rather than disciplined by their seniors.

We cannot pause to trace the principal events of Bishop Strachan's Episcopate. Its characteristics sprang from his past life as the harvest comes from its seed. The vigorous boy, the faithful pupil, the devoted son, the successful teacher, the active clergyman, matured by a species of inevitable growth into the strong, enterprising, indomitable, veteran Bishop. His experiences during the Canadian invasion which marked our last war with England, were more creditable to his Scotch courage than to our American gallantry. We commend that part of the narrative in which they are recorded as giving an amusing specimens of genuine clerical pluck.

The efforts of Bishop Strachan in the cause of education are above praise. His plans were large in their conception, practical in their nature, and successful in their execution. King's College, Toronto, is perhaps his noblest monument. But in all respects he was devoted to Canada, to his Diocese, to his Church. His single aim was duty. His strongest incentive was to do good. His ruling principle was God's glory. He fell at last, not like the old oak of

the mountain, remarkable only for its fruitless majesty. Rather he resembled the ancient orchard tree, laden with its autumn burdens, and all whose juices had been employed to drop ripe blessings from its bending limbs.

WORDS AND THEIR USES.*

DISCRIMINATION in language is like taste in Art. It implies a capacity born in the man. Education may improve, but can never create the faculty. Addison and Irving possessed it in perfection. Yet neither was absolutely correct. Many of their pages are marked by rhetorical improprieties, and even sometimes by grammatical inaccuracies. Yet they had the musical sense, the exquisite discernment, the vivid fancy, and all that delicate organization peculiar to fine genius, which gave a constant charm to their style, so that criticism almost blushes in its dissection, like a modest woman compelled to view a beautiful body cut by a surgeon's knife. Richard Grant White certainly shows in the *Spectator* of Joseph Addison faults which are surprising in kind and in number, and yet his own pages compared with those he so unsparingly and yet justly censures are like a bed of cabbages next to a bloom of roses. The very first sentence of his book is inexpressibly awkward. He cannot make the slightest pretensions to elegance. He continually challenges contrast, and excites indignation by his stern but usually just criticisms of authors so immeasurably his superiors in grace and beauty of expression. This accounts for the severity with which his excellent book has been often treated. Many of his observations are original, instructive and valuable. They often show a mastery of his subject. The chapters entitled, "Big Words for Small Thoughts," "British English, and American English," "Style," "Misused Words," "Some Criticisms," deserve to be universally read and pondered. We think their perusal will be equally serviceable to John Bull and to Brother Jonathan. They show that the father has not much to boast over the son. They prove that among the uneducated the love of slang is always inveterate, and that the style and pronunciation of cultivated persons are very much the same every-

* Words and their Uses. Past and Present. A Study of the English Language. By Richard Grant White. New York: Sheldon & Co., 498 and 500 Broadway, 1870.

where. We have all our lives heard as good English among the gentlemen and ladies of Ohio as we have ever heard among the gentlemen and ladies of New York.

Mr. White has, we think, like all critics, become injured by his vocation. He magnifies his office. He is excessive in his industry. He is often painful in his dissections. In seeking to confine words too strictly to the meaning suggested by their derivation he sometimes overlooks the inevitable law of use, and his criticisms would greatly deprive our language of its wealth and flexibility. His preference for Saxon is certainly unguarded. The genius of our English language adapts everything to itself, and its chief glory is its power to enrich itself from every tongue, and yet never lose its individuality.

But whatever may be the particular faults of Mr. Grant's book it is, as a whole, alike creditable to the author and to his country. He shows industry, judgment, independence originality, vigor. We overlook the inelegance of his style in the excellence of his suggestions. Perhaps no American could treat the subject better. This volume supplements admirably the capital work of Trench, and cannot fail to accomplish practical good in America.

It may be profitable to close our notice with Mr. Grant's deserved and pointed rebuke to our modern Dictionary makers.

"Open almost any Dictionary, the Imperial, Webster's, or Worcester's—but Webster's is the most superfluous and obtrusive in this respect, because it carries to the furthest extreme the vicious plan of vocabulary-making and definition introduced by Johnson—open it at random, and see how it is loaded down with this worthless lumber of words formed by joining *milk* and some other word together.* There are twenty-two, of which number are *milk-pail*, *milk-pan*, *milk-porridge*, *milk-score*, *milk-white*; and yet *milk-punch*, *milk-train*, and *milk-poultice*, are omitted. *Straw* furnishes twelve compound words, so-called, of which are *straw-color*, *straw-colored*, *straw-crowned*, *straw-cutter*, *straw-stuffed*, and even *straw-hat*. Yet in vain will Margery Daw look for *straw-bed*, or Recorder Hackett seek the word *straw-bail*. Of words, so-called, made by the union of *heart* with another,† there are actually sixty-nine paraded, *heart* itself having sixteen meanings assigned to it simply, and eleven in established phrases. After being told that *head*, simple of itself, has thirty-one distinct meanings, we are presented with it in combination with other simple words thirty-seven times. *Sea* is repeated in combination with other words one hundred and fifty-seven times. Perhaps the most auda-

* "Joining together." Does Mr. White approve?

† Another? Does Mr. Grant mean another word or another heart?

cious of all these presentations of simple words in couples as words with individual claims to places in an English vocabulary, is the array in which *self* is shown in conjunction with some noun, adjective, or participle. Of these are actually in Webster's Dictionary one hundred and ninety-six. Not one of all this number, from the first, *self-abased*, to the midmost, *self-denial*, and the last, *self-wrong*, has a right to a place in an English Dictionary, for in every case *self*, in the simple primitive sense it always preserves, is a mere adjective, qualifying the word that follows it, and there is no reason why, if the combination thus detailed should appear in a Dictionary, all other possible combinations of *self* should not also be presented. The list is either entirely superfluous, or very defective. In fact such an array is an affront to the understanding of an English-speaking people."

BOOKS AND READING.*

READING is a characteristic of our age. The day begins and ends with the newspaper, while the interval is crowded with dailies, weeklies, monthlies, quarterlies—pamphlets, magazines, books—almost libraries. Volumes of every imaginable kind in title, binding, size, subject, appearance, salute us on car, and steamboat, and vessel. Electricity flashes the news, steam prints it, and every day over the world affords us the history of its predecessor. Now amid all this fecundity of the Press a man thoroughly disciplined is seldom burdened or perplexed. Minds trained from youth in school and college by a certain nice intuition guide themselves to those authors suited to their intellectual wants, and soon acquire those habits of reading which spring naturally and inevitably from the mental constitution. The multitude, on the other hand, governed by impulse and circumstances, procure any volumes which may amuse, or occupy the moment. Rules for reading are either not needed, or they are disregarded by the two classes named, and these constitute the vast majority of the people. Between these extremes, however, are a thoughtful and conscientious few to whom some wise directions will be most welcome, and for them nothing could be more timely, or more suitable than Professor Porter's book. If not always evincing care, it was written for a practical object, and will probably accomplish what the author intended. While not remarkable for any peculiar fascinations, it is clear, comprehensive, suggestive, instructive. An ex-

* Books and Reading; or what Books shall I read, and how shall I read them? By Noah Porter, D.D., LL.D., Professor in Yale College. New York: Charles Scribner & Co., 1871.

tract from the Second Chapter will afford us a good specimen of the style of the Book.

"To read an author is, however, more than to hold communion with a mind in its ordinary state, or by the usual method of hearing the conversation of a person, even in his happiest mood. For by the act of writing the mind is ordinarily raised to its highest energy both of thought and feeling. It condenses, as it were, and intensifies itself, "whatever is good into what is doubly good; whatever is bad into what is doubly bad." It follows from this, that a book does not merely represent its author, but it represents the best part of him—or it may be the worst. It gives the picture of his inner self in forms enlarged and ideally improved. The colors are more intense and more finely contrasted than in the reality of his ordinary experience. Hence reading a man's book is often worth more than listening to his conversation. Hence too, a good book is of more value to the world than a good man—for it is the best part of a good man—the good without the evil. Thus when a wise man dies, while his spirit is living in one immortal life, he may also be living another immortality on earth—occupying perhaps a wider sphere than when he was in the body—his thoughts quickening the thoughts of others, as if he were present to speak them, his feelings inspiring the noblest feelings of others, and his principles prompting to worthy deeds after his own last action is done."

BOOKS RECEIVED.*

SHILOH, or WITHOUT AND WITHIN. By W. M. L. Jay. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 713 Broadway. Hartford: Church Press Company, 1870.

HISTORY OF LOUIS XIV. By John S. C. Abbott, with illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square, 1871.

THE UNKIND WORD AND OTHER STORIES. By the author of "John Halifax, Gentleman," &c., &c. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square, 1870.

CHRISTENDOM SKETCHED FROM HISTORY IN THE LIGHT OF HOLY SCRIPTURE. By Charles Girdlestone, M. A., Rector of Kingswinford, Staffordshire. London: Published for the author by Sampson Low, Son & Marston, 188 Fleet Street, 1870.

* Many of these books deserve a notice which must be omitted, or deferred, from want of space in this number of the Review.

THE KINDERGARTEN. A Manual for the introduction of Froebel's System of Primary Education into Public Schools. By Dr. Adolf Douai. New York: E. Steiger, 1871.

GREEK PRAXIS: Or Greek for Beginners. By J. A. Spencer, S. T. D., Professor of the Greek Language and Literature in the College of the City of New York. New York: Ivison, Blake-man, Taylor & Co., 1870.

FAIR FRANCE. Impressions of a Traveler. By the author of "John Halifax, Gentleman." New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square, 1871.

SUNDAY ECHOES IN WEEK-DAY HOURS. A tale illustrative of the Church Catechism. By Mrs. Carey Brock, author of "Sunday Echoes in Week Day Hours," a tale illustrative of the Collects. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 713 Broadway, 1871.

THE SOUL'S INQUIRIES ANSWERED IN THE WORDS OF SCRIPTURE. Arranged by G. Washington Moon, Member of the Council of the Royal Society of Literature. London: Hatchard's, 187 Piccadilly. New York: Pott & Amery & Cooper Union, 1870.

CULTURE AND THE GOSPEL: Or a plea for the sufficiency of the Gospel to meet the wants of an enlightened age. By Rev. S. McCall, Old Saybrook, Conn. New York: A. D. F. Randolph & Co., 1871.

THE CHURCHMAN'S YEAR BOOK, with Kalendar for the Year of Grace, 1871. Compiled by William Stevens Perry, D. D. Hartford: Church Press Company, 1871.

BY THE SEA. By Mrs. Sophronia Currier, author of "Alice Tracy." New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 713 Broadway, 1871.

NED, NELLIE, AND AMY: A Story of the White Hills. By Mary H. Seymour. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 713 Broadway, 1871.

HYMNS TO JESUS. From the Early English. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 713 Broadway, 1870.

THE APPLE CULTURIST. By Sereno Edwards Todd, author of "Todd's Young Farmer Manual," &c. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square, 1871.

SIX BOOKS OF THE *ÆNEID* OF VIRGIL, with explanatory notes and vocabulary. By Thomas Chase, M. A., Professor of Philology in Harvard College, Member of the American Oriental and American Philosophical Society. Philadelphia: Eldredge & Brother. Boston: J. S. Hammett. New York: J. W. Schermerhorn & Co. Cincinnati: Geo. E. Stevens & Co. Chicago: W. B. Keene & Cooke, 1871.

FIRST LESSONS IN COMPOSITION. By John S. Hart, LL. D., Principal of New Jersey State Normal School, author of "Composition and Rhetoric;" "In the School Room;" "English Grammar," etc. Philadelphia: Eldredge & Brother. Boston: J. S. Hammett. New York: J. W. Schermerhorn & Co. Cincinnati: Geo. E. Stevens & Co. Chicago: W. B. Keene & Cooke, 1871.

WILSON'S NEW SPELLER AND ANALYZER. By Marcus Wilson. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square, 1871.

HOW PLANTS GROW: A simple introduction to Structural Botany, with a Popular Flora. Illustrated by 500 engravings. New York: Ivison, Blakeman, Taylor & Co., 47 and 49 Greene St. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co., 39 and 41 Lake Street, 1869.

T. MACCI PLAUTI, CAPTIVI TRINUMMUS, ET RUDENS, with English notes, critical and explanatory. By B. C. Harrington, M. A., Professor of Latin in the Wesleyan University. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square, 1870.

THE WRITINGS OF ANNE ISABELLA THACKERAY, with illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square, 1870.

THE CRYPTOGRAM: A Novel. By James De Mille, with illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square, 1871.

AN INDEX TO HARPER'S NEW MONTHLY MAGAZINE, Volumes I. to XL., from JUNE 1850 to MAY 1870. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square, 1870.

AMERICAN EDITION OF DR. WILLIAM SMITH'S DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE. Revised and Edited by Professor H. B. Hackett, D. D., with the co-operation of Ezra Abbott, LL. D., Assistant Librarian of Harvard University. Vols. XXV. to XXXII. New York: Hurd & Houghton, 1870.